Bookseller
to Paternoster Row
LONDON EC
ESTD 1815

Library of the Theological Seminary.

PRINCETON, N. J.

Collection of Puritan Literature.

Division SCB
Section 11130
Number

94

Robt Burnetts

Book

Calf Lettered

5/6

the Gift of B Robinson who wrote
a work on Liturgies

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2012 with funding from
Princeton Theological Seminary Library

http://archive.org/details/nakedpop00baxt

B. Robinson.

Naked Popery;

OR, THE

NAKED FALSHOOD

Of a Book called the

CATHOLICK NAKED TRUTH,

OR THE

Puritan Convert to Apostolical Christianity; Written by *W. H.*

Opening their Fundamental Errour of Unwritten Tradition, and their unjust Description of the *Puritan*, the *Prelatical Protestant*, and the *Papist*, and their differences; and better acquainting the ignorant of the true difference, especially what a *Puritan* and what a *Papist* is.

By *RICHARD BAXTER*, a Professor of meer Apostolical Christianity.

Trita frequensq; via est per Amici fallere nomen;
Trita frequensq; licet sit via, crimen habet.

The common beaten way of mens deceit
Is as a *Loving Friend* to work the Cheat:
But though this be the common beaten way,
It will prove criminal——another day.

W. H. this Author, *pag.* 25. saith [*If you do not find that*—*they* (*your Catholick Neighbours*) *hold nothing, nor Practise nothing, but what they are able to give a very satisfactory account of to any impartial Enquirer, then say, I am a Knave, a Lyar, and a Cheat, one that deserveth no mercy from God or Man, in this World or the next.*].

LONDON,
Printed for *N. Simmons* at the Princes Arms in S. *Paul's* Church-Yard. MDCLXXVII.

TO THE AUTHOR AND HIS RELATIONS.

CHAP. I.

WHEN the Confutation of the Treatiſe of Tranſubſtantiation was in the Preſs, this Book came to my notice, written, if the Stile may go for Proof, by the *ſame Author*: It is conjectured that your Name is Mr. *W. Hutchinſon* of *Lincolnſhire*, ſometime of *Queens Colledge* in *Cambridge*; and that it is indeed your neareſt Relations whom you ſo earneſtly labour to pervert: Your *Stile* perſwadeth me that you are *ſerious*, and verily think that your way is right: And I ſuppoſe you ſee that we alſo are as confident of the truth of our Profeſſion, as you are of yours: The Queſtion is, whether it be *your* Zeal, or *ours*, that is according to Knowledge?

The Title of your Religion greatly pleaſeth me, and is the ſame that I aſſume: For we are, I perceive, agreed in this, that it is [*the Apoſtolical Chriſtianity*] that is the true and ſafe Religion: And hath God left the matter ſo obſcure as that we cannot come to an agreement in ſo weighty a matter of Fact, as to know what [*the Apoſtolical Chriſtianity*] was; when even Common Hiſtory giveth us notice what the *Athenian* Philoſophers held, and what the ancient *Romans* held, and ſo of almoſt every literate Nation? *You* ſtudy, and *we* ſtudy; *You* pray, and *we* pray: You would know the truth, whatever it coſt you, and ſo would We. As a Man that looketh daily when I am called away to God, I ſolemnly proteſt, that if I could find that Popery were the true Apoſtolick Chriſtianity, I would joyfully quit all the Friends, Hope, and Intereſts of this World, to embrace it. What is it that is your advantage, and what is our diſadvantage? Are you more impartial in your ſearch? I am ſo Conſcious of my Impartiality, that I cannot believe that this maketh the difference. Is it that we have not read the Papiſts writings? I have reaſon to believe that I have read as many of them, at leaſt, as you have done, if you are not much above ſixty years of age (as I hear you are not near it). But you have Converſed with more of them than I have done? It's like you have: But is that the reaſon of my miſtake? You earneſtly invite your Relations to Converſe with the Papiſts, becauſe mens *writings* may be miſtaken: And on this ground I perceive you build all the certainty of your Faith, That *our Fathers* and *our Grand-Fathers* have told us Infallibly, what they received from their Fathers and Grand-Fathers, and ſo on. This is your certainty.

I will tell you briefly what I take for the *Apoſtolical Chriſti-*

Christianity, and by what Notices I receive it; and then I will again consider yours.

I take not *Christianity* to be a thing so hardly to be known, as you would make it; either as to *the Being* of it, or the *Publication*. I take it to have its *Essentials*, *Integrals*, and *Accidentals*; and that these are not to be confounded: If it cannot be readily known what Christianity is, how shall we preach it to Heathens? or how shall Christians be known to others, or themselves? and who can have the comfort of an unknown Religion?

You tell us that nothing of it is *written* in the New Testament, but the Life of Christ by four Men, and a few occasional Epistles, *&c.* But do you think that Christ himself did not institute Christianity, and tell Men plainly what it was? Did not those four Men write *Christ's Doctrine* as well as his *Life*? And is he not the *Author of our Faith*? Did he not preach the Gospel? And do you not call these four Books the four Evangelists? And doth not the Gospel contain and describe Christianity? Did not Christ oft tell us what it is to be his Disciples? And were not the Disciples called Christians shortly after, as words of the same signification? But what place is there for any doubt, when Christ himself did institute Baptism, and describe it? and command that all Nations being Discipled should be Baptized into the Name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost; as being the Faith which Disciples must profess? And do not you to this day profess, that Baptizing is Christening, and that Baptism washeth away all sin, (supposing the Baptized to receive it as Baptism, by true Covenant-consent at least?) And doth not Baptism enter us into the true Church of Christ? Sure all this is past dispute; where then is the difficulty? Is not a truly baptized

zed Person a Christian? And was it then as hard a matter as you make it, to know *what Faith was necessary to Baptism*, (in the Person at age, or the Parent of Infants?) Surely then the Scripture, that mentioneth the History of so many thousands baptized, would have told us of that grand Controversie, and how it was decided. But no such Controversie was then debated, for ought we there find. If Baptismal Covenanting with God the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, as our God and Father reconciled in Christ, our Saviour, and our Sanctifier, be not the *Symbol* or *Badge* of *Christians*, and that which visibly maketh them such; your own Church, and all the Christian World is deceived. And we know that it was not the Custom of the Apostles and Pastors of the ancient Churches, to make a meer Ceremony and dead Formality of Baptism, by baptizing those that would but say the words [*I believe in God the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost,*] without understanding what they said: And therefore their ordinary Preaching was the Exposition of these three Articles: And the Creed called The Apostles, is the Exposition of these three Articles; which though some Clauses were since added, and though the Churches tyed not themselves just to the very same words, (as we find by the various forms of this Creed in *Irenæus*, *Tertullian*, *Marcellus's* in *Epiphanius*, *Ruffinus*, *&c.*) yet for the substance and sense, and most of the very words, all Churches used the same. And when the Council of *Nice* taught them the way of making new Creeds, (which *Hilary Pictav.* so sadly complaineth of,) yet still the matter of the old Creed was the substance of them all. And the Eastern Creed, which was used before the *Nicene* Council, (for that such a one there was, the most Learned Antiquaries give us sufficient proof,) was but the same in sense

ſenſe as the Weſtern, even the Expoſition of the Baptiſmal Faith; and this the Baptized did profeſs before Baptiſm: And the work of Catechiſts was to teach this and the ſenſe of it to the Catechumens. And that [*He that believeth and is baptized* (that is, truly devoted to God the Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, by the Baptiſmal Covenant) *ſhall be ſaved, and he that believeth not ſhall be damned,*] is by Chriſt himſelf made the ſum of his Goſpel, or Law of Grace.

As the Image of the bleſſed Trinity on mans Soul is *Life*, *Light*, and *Love*; ſo the ſummaries of that ſacred Doctrine which muſt imprint it on us, is the *Symbolum Fidei*, the *Creed*, the ſummary of things to be *believed*; and the *Lords Prayer*, the *Symbolum* and ſummary of things to be *willed*, *deſired*, and *ſought*; and the *Decalogue*, the ſummary of *things to be practiſed*; being the Directory of Mans three Faculties, the *Intellect*, the *will*, and the *Executive Power*. And all this we believe was delivered to the Churches by the Apoſtles, and received by all Chriſtians, many years (eight at leaſt) before any Book of the New Teſtament was written: And for the fuller underſtanding and improvement of it, and for all the integral parts of Religion that were to be added, the Apoſtles and Evangeliſts more enlargedly preached them to the People in their Sermons, as Chriſt himſelf had done much of them. We receive all that, as Gods Word, which by theſe Apoſtles was delivered as ſuch to the Churches; becauſe they had the promiſe of the Holy Ghoſt to lead them into all truth, and to bring all things that Chriſt taught and commanded to their remembrance. We are aſſured that all that is contained in the *New Teſtament* was written by ſuch *inſpired Perſons*; and that the Spirit of God well knew, that when they

were

were to dye, without written Records, the memory of Mankind would not faithfully retain, and deliver to Posterity, such copious matter as the *Integrals* and useful *Accidentals* of Religion, and therefore caused them to write it and leave it to Posterity.

So that our Christian Religion is contained and delivered to us in *three Formulas* or *Prescripts*: The *first* containeth the *whole Essence of Christianity*, and is the *Sacramental Covenant*, in which we are believingly given up to God the *Father*, *Son*, *and Holy Ghost*, and God to us, in the Relation of a God and Father, a Saviour and a Sanctifier. This is done initially, *ad esse*, in Baptism, and after *ad robur* in the *Lords Supper*. This is delivered to us by *Tradition Naturally Infallible*, *de facto*: For *all Christians*, *as such*, have received and entred this *Sacramental Covenant*; and full History assureth us, that the very same Form of it is come down in all the Churches to this day.

The second *Formula*, is the *Exposition* of the three Articles of this Sacramental Covenant, in the *Creed*, *Lords Prayer*, and *Decalogue*; which hath been delivered by memory also, and kept unchanged (save the foresaid additions of some explicatory words in the *Creed*,) to all the Churches to this day.

The third *Form*, is *all the holy Canonical Scriptures*, (the Old Testament being as preparatory to the New,) which contain all the *Essentials*, *Integrals*, *and needful Accidentals*.

Our Religion then is all from Christ and his Spirit, in inspired men, commissioned to deliver it, and is well called as you do, the *Apostolical Christianity*: We own no other. It is all brought down to us by Tradition from the Apostles. The *Essentials* in the Covenant, and the explicatory

explicatory Symbols or Summaries, are delivered to us two ways: First by *Memory and Practice* most currant and certain from Generation to Generation, being no more than what Memory might well retain, whereto yet the helps of the *Ancients Writings* reciting the Forms were used for the fuller certainty of Posterity. Secondly in the *holy Scriptures*, where they are contained (as the *Brain*, *Heart*, and *Stomach*, in the Body) among all the rest as the *Principal* Parts. The third form is so large that Memory could not preserve it, and therefore God would have it delivered us in that Writing which we all call the Sacred Bible, or Canonical Scripture. This containeth thousands of words more than are of absolute necessity to Salvation; but no more than is useful or helpful to Salvation.

In all this I have shewed you what our Religion is, (*Objectively* taken) and which way we receive it. Where you are therefore to note, 1. That all our Sermons, Writings, Church-Articles, *&c.* are but the Expressions of our *Subjective Religion*, telling other Men how particular Men, and particular Churches, understand those *Divine Forms* which are our *Objective* Religion: These are various as Churches and Persons are, every one having his own Faith and Religion in different measures, and such expressions being but our *fides mensurata* may be altered and amended, and we pretend not to perfection in them: But the former being our *fides vel Religio mensurans*, our *Divine Objective* Faith or Religion, is inculpable and unalterable.

2. Note that *you Papists* do grant all *our Objective Faith and Religion*, even every word of it, to be *true*, *infallible*, *and of God*: You own, I say, every word of *our Religion*: That is, all the *Sacramental Covenant*, all the

Creed, Lords Prayer, and Decalogue, and all that which we call the holy *Canonical Scriptures*. But we own not all yours: So that you do not, you cannot find fault with the leaſt Particle of our Religion as to the truth of it; but, 1. You think that it is not *enough*: And 2. That we come not to it the right way, that is, we take not our Faith upon the word of Papiſts, as Papiſts. Is not this the difference? And is not this all that you cry out againſt us for?

And now let us ſee whether your way be better and ſurer than this of ours is?

I. Your Religion is much Bigger than ours.

II. You hold it on other Reaſons, and plead another way of receiving it.

I. Your Religion (Objective) containeth, beſides all our Bible, all the *Apocryphal Books*, and all the *Decrees of General Councils*, and all the other *un-written Traditions* (if there be any more, who knows what?) you name your ſelf here, *faſting on Frydays, and on the vigils of Saints, Ember-days, Lent, and Images*, and ſuch like.

Here now we humbly propoſe to your conſideration; 1. Whether you will take all theſe into the *Eſſentials of Chriſtianity*, or not? If not, a Man may be *a Chriſtian*; and conſequently of the Church or Body of Chriſt, and in a ſtate of Salvation without them. Why then do you deny them this, and make them to be as out of the true Church and ſtate of Life? If yea,

Q. 2. Did all that the Apoſtles Baptized, believe all the *Apocrypha* and all the *Decrees of your Councils*, and your Oral Traditions?

Q. 3. Did the ancient Fathers and Catechiſts teach all thoſe to the Catechumens before they Baptized them?

Q. 4. And were not thoſe all Chriſtians, and in the true

true Church, and in a ſtate of Life, whom the Apoſtles Baptized, without the profeſſion of any ſuch Belief?

Q. 5. What was the *Creed*, the *Symbolum fidei* uſed for, if not to diſtinguiſh the Faith of the Chriſtian Church from Infidelity, Hereſie, and all without? And if all the Decrees of Councils be as neceſſary to be the *Symbol of Faith*, why were they not all made up into a Creed? and why is the Creed differenced from them all to this day? And why do you not cauſe the Baptized to recite and profeſs all theſe Councils Decrees, but only the old Chriſtian Creed?

Q. 6. Doth not Chriſt at the Inſtitution of his Sacrament, *Mat.* 28. expreſly promiſe that *he that believeth* (according to Baptiſm, in the *Father*, *Son*, *and Holy Ghoſt*) *ſhall be ſaved*?

Q. 7. Is it not a reproach to God and the Chriſtian Religion, to tell the World that God hath written us by his Spirit ſo great a Book as the Bible is, and yet there is not in it enough to Salvation, but that abundance *unneceſſary* to Salvation is in it, and ſome neceſſary things left out?

Q. 8. Have your Oral ſuperadded Traditions more *Evidence of Truth than the Bible*, or more *Evidence of Neceſſity* to be believed? Not more Evidence of *Truth*: For you confeſs the certain *Truth* of all the Bible, and that as fully manifeſt as your Additions. If it have more Evidence of *Neceſſity*, what is it? It is not becauſe it is a *Divine Revelation*: For ſo you confeſs all the Bible to be? And do you pretend to a Tradition that ſaith, [You may be ſaved without moſt of the Bible, though it be of God, but not without faſting on *Frydays*, or on the Vigils of Saints-days, or other ſuch Traditions?]. But if you will make both the whole *Bible* and *Tradition neceſſary to be*

believed, it must be either Explicitely, or as you call it, *Implicitely*: If Explicitely, (that is, as each Point is particularly understood and believed,) then it's doubtful whether there be one Man in the World that is a Christian, and can be saved? If *Implicitely*, that is, *Virtually* as it is in some General Proposition, what is that *General*? Is it that *All that God revealeth is true*? Or that *All that the Spirit of Christ in his Apostles delivered to the Church as his word, is true.* These we all agree in, if this will serve the turn? Is it that the Church is the *Ministerial Keeper* of the Sacred Doctrine as delivered? This also we agree in. Or is it that *the Church de eventu shall never corrupt, alter, or lose, this word, or any part of it*? If you mean it of every particular Church, we are agreed of the contrary. You confess that many Churches have fallen to Heresie, and many Apostatized from the Faith: If you speak of the *Universal Church*, we are agreed that the *Universal Church* shall never Apostatize; for if Christ had no Church, he were no *Head* of it. And we are agreed that they shall never turn such *true Hereticks*, as hold not truly *all the Essentials of Christianity*: For such also are *no Christians*; because each Essential part is necessary to the *Essence*. But whether the *Universal Church*, much more the *Greater part*, may not make or receive some culpable alteration by Amission, Omission, or Commission, we have reason to question? We never heard any Proof that the Negative was necessary to Salvation, nor is it held by all your selves; and whether by any one man I cannot tell: For you take the Bible to be Gods Word, and your knowledge of the various Readings of the Hebrew and Greek Copies, and the multitude of Errours in the Vulgar Latine corrected by *P. Clem.* 8. and *Sixtus* 5. do satisfie all the World, that you hold that the

Uni-

Universal Church, or the major part, even your own, may culpably erre, or alter the very written Word of God. And who would then believe you, if you said, [*But the Unwritten Word it cannot alter?*] It's true indeed, the *Essentials* considered, as Written or Unwritten, all the true Church, nor any one Christian, while such, cannot deny: But sure, if many thousand Errours may be found in that Book which you take your selves for the Word of God, and this through the fault or failing of such as have had the keeping of it; and *all Divine Revelations* are to be *believed*, and all the *Word of God is Divine Revelation*, it notoriously followeth, That your own Church hath not kept all that is *matter of Divine Faith* from alteration. So that though many of your Wranglers will not distinguish the *Essentials* of Christianity (called Fundamentals) from the *Integrals* and *Accidentals*, (as if Christianity were nothing, and had no determinate Essence,) yet this sheweth, that you must do it whether you will or not; or else you must confess that your Church may alter any thing, or every thing, as it hath done all these fore-mentioned: Which we will not confess of the Church Universal.

But, I suppose that we have not yet met with the Faith that you account necessary to salvation: *It is that the Pope of Rome, and a General Council, cannot erre, in delivering to us the Apostolical Doctrine to be believed.* And this is an implicite believing of all that is written in Scripture, and that is delivered orally from the Apostles. If so, words and names go very far with you as to mens salvation. Is this to believe a thousand things which a man never knew or heard of? if he do but believe the Infallibility of your Church? What! Believe that which I never once thought of? But this is but *Implicite Faith*?

A

A cheating Name for *No-belief of those things:* For by *Implicite* here you can mean only *Virtual*, and that is no *Actual Belief* of that thing at all, but of something else, which would infer more were it known: Nay *Virtual* is too high a Name for it.

But will this serve the turn to salvation, to believe that *the Pope and his Council are Infallible?* What! though the same Person believe not in God the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, nor any of the Articles of his Creed, no not a Life to come? If you say, Yea; Then will you call this Christianity, to believe in the Pope, and not in Christ? Or do you mean, that men may be saved without Christianity, but not without Popery? If so, why was not the Popes Name, rather than Christs, put into Baptism and the Creed, or at least with Christs?

But the insuperable difficulty is, How must I believe that the Pope hath this Infallibility? From Christ, or otherwise? If not from Christ, tell me which way, and why I must believe it? If from Christ, can I believe that the Pope hath Power from Christ, before I believe that there is a Christ, that hath such Power to give? And can I believe in Christ, and not believe that there is a God that sent him? Can I believe that Jesus is the Christ, and not believe that he is a Sacrifice for sin, or a Mediator between God and Man, and came to save his People from their sins? And can I believe this, and not believe that we are all sinners, and that sin deserveth that punishment which Christ came to save us from? Is not our Saviour, and our Sin and Misery relatives? as a Physician, or Medicine and a Disease? And can we believe that we have sin and desert of Punishment, without believing that God is our Governour, and gave us that Law which we broke, and which obligeth us to Punishment? Can

we

we believe in Christ, and not believe that he is God and Man, that he dyed, rose, and ascended into Heaven, and will judge us at last? and that he pardoneth sin, reneweth Souls by his Spirit, and will give us life hereafter? All these are included in believing in Christ, as Christ. And how must I believe that Christ hath given the Pope this Infallibility or Power? By any written word which granteth it? or by Oral Tradition? If by the written Word, then I must believe that that Word is true, before I can believe that the Pope is made Pope or Infallible by it? If by Oral Tradition, whose must that be? Then I must believe some bodies Oral Tradition as true and infallible, before I believe in the Pope at all. If it be the first Hearers of the Apostles, then either the Pope was one of those, or not. If *yea*, and he hath a Negative Voice in the credible report, then I must believe him as Infallible, before he is proved Infallible, in order to my believing that he is *Infallible*, which is a contradiction. If *Not*, Then I must believe the Infallibility of *other Hearers* of the Apostles, before I can believe the Pope's? And the Question will recur, How I shall know them to be Infallible? And who they were that were those Infallible Witnesses? Whether Pastors only, or the People? Whether of some one Church, or of all the Churches? And how I shall prove that they gave such a Testimony?

So that your pretense of a Necessity of receiving Gods Word, or the Christian Faith, from the Pope and his Council cometh too late: For it seemeth that we must believe it first, before it be possible to believe in the Pope and Council as authorised by Christ.

And if my Implicite Faith be the Belief of this Article, [*Any Church in all the world, yea, the greater part*

of

of all the Churches, may err in matters of Faith, or Apostatize, and only the Pope of Rome *and his Council cannot*:] What Proof, or whose Tradition doth this rest upon?

Q. 9. Do not *Bellarmine*, *Costerus*, and many of your Writers profess that the Scriptures contain all things ordinarily necessary to Salvation? Yea many Writers, that the Creed hath all that is absolutely to be believed? Yea some, that it hath more than all? Yea abundance (Cited by *Fr. a Sancta Clara*) that the Belief in Christ is not necessary to all? And will you say then, that he that believeth Explicitely the *whole Bible* cannot be saved without believing also your pretended Traditions?

Q. 10. And do you not hereby, instead of the *light burden and easie yoak* of Christ, and his *Commands which are not grievous*, bring Christians under a harder yoak than that which the *Jews* were not able to bear? When it seemed good to the Holy Ghost in the Apostles to impose but a few and necessary things, *Act.* 15. 28. And how large a Law is all the Bible, and all your Councils Decrees, and Oral Traditions, set together? Do all your Priests themselves, or one of an hundred, understand them all, or know what they are?

Q. 11. While you pretend a Necessity of your numerous Ceremonies, (as Fasting on *Frydays*, and such other named by you,) do you not lay a snare of perpetual Division in the Churches? and do you not make as many inconsistent Churches, as there be Societies of Christians that differ (and still will differ) about any of those Traditions or Ceremonies?

Q. 12. And do you not lay open your own Church, to the accusation of *innovation*, *mutability*, and *corruption*, when it is not to be denyed, but in such things as those they have been mutable or innovated? Have you

not

not long left the Cuſtom of *adoring on the Lords-days without genuflexion*, though the firſt great General Council (*Nic. Can.* 20.) and the ancient Fathers commonly, made it a Tradition, and Practice of the whole Church? and it was Decreed to be ſo uſed by all? Abundance of ſuch Inſtances may be given.

Q. 13. You do very injuriouſly to your own Sect and Cauſe, here to pretend Tradition as coming down from the Apoſtles, for ſuch things as your own Doctors plead but your Churches later Inſtitution for: It's fully proved by *Daleus de jejuniis*, that the Lent Faſt was long but for a ſhort time, before it came to fourty days: And it's an odd thing, if you will pretend Tradition from the Apoſtles, for the Holy-days, or the Vigil Faſts, of thoſe Saints that were born many hundred years after the Apoſtles death?

We confeſs our Faith is not ſo big as yours? We have many ſcore Texts of Scripture that promiſe Salvation to them that believe much leſs than the Bible it ſelf containeth. Yet we profeſs our ſelves ready to believe as much more as you ſhall ever prove to us, to have been delivered by the Apoſtles, to the Church, to be believed.

II. And for the ſecond, (that we *receive not our Faith the way that you do*; that is, from the *Authority of the Pope and Papiſts*, and from *your Tradition*:) We crave your conſideration of theſe Queſtions.

1. When the Apoſtles (*and Diſciples*, *Act.* 8.) were ſcattered, and preached the Goſpel to many Nations, Were they not true Chriſtians, and ſaved, that received the Goſpel from any one of them, or from any Perſon whatſoever? If *Aquila* or *Priſcilla* Converted a Sinner, ſuch a one ſaved a Soul from Death, though *Peter* did it not; nor his Authority was known to ſuch a one?

2. Do you believe that if the *Roman* Biſhop or Churches Revelation or Propoſal were neceſſary to true Faith and to Salvation, that Chriſt would never have told Men ſo? Nor any of his Apoſtles have left it us on Record? When there were Hereſies and Schiſmes ſo wofully troubling the Churches as we find in *Paul*'s Epiſtles to the *Cor. Gal. Col.* and in the *Rev.* 2. and 3. *ch.* ſhould we never have found one word for this ſpeedy way of deciſion, to appeal to the Church of *Rome*? Would *Paul* have rebuked them for ſaying, *I am of Cephas*, and made him but a *Miniſter by whom they believed*, without ever mentioning his Office and Dignity? would he never have told the Church of *Rome* of their Miſtriſ-ſhip and Infallibility above the reſt? Would ſo neceſſary a Fundamental of Faith have been ſo much ſilenced?

3. Did the Apoſtles, Evangeliſts, or ancient Fathers, uſe to Convert Infidels by any ſuch Method, and telling them that they muſt believe, firſt the Infallibility of the Biſhop of *Rome* and his Clergie, and then believe the Goſpel becauſe he ſaith it is true? Had this been the old Method, would there not have been more Books neceſſary, and written, to prove this firſt Fundamental (the *Infallibility of the* Roman *Biſhop and his Councils*) than to have proved the Goſpel it ſelf directly? Is it not a wonder that we ſhould have ſuch Volumes as *Euſebius* his *Præparatio & Demonſtratio Evangel.* and ſo many written by thoſe before and after him, to prove the *Goſpel*, and none of them hit on this Method, nor write at large to make it good? The Churches Authority and Unity, is ordinarily pleaded againſt *Hereſies and Schiſmes*, but who ever *Converted Infidels* by the Authority of the Papal Church, either proved or aſſerted as the neceſſary *Medium* of Faith?

4. Do

4. Do you not confeſs that all other Churches may erre beſides the *Roman*? And their plea of Tradition you account invalid: Your Book called [*Conſiderations on the Council of Trent*, by *R. H.*] *p.* 40. ſaith, [" *All Con-* " *ciliary Definitions are not only Declarations and Teſtifi-* " *cations of ſuch Apoſtolical Traditions as were left by them* " *evident and conſpicuous in all Chriſtian Churches Planted* " *by them; but are many times Determinations of Points* " *deduced from, and neceſſary conſequents to, ſuch clear Tradi-* " *tionals, whether written or unwritten.* 2. *If the Acts* " *of General Councils were only ſuch Declarations of Apo-* " *ſtolical Tradition, yet it is poſſible that ſome particular* " *Church, may in time, depart from ſuch a Tradition en-* " *truſted to them; elſe how can any Church become Hereti-* " *cal againſt any ſuch Tradition*?]

Do you not at this day accuſe the *Greek Church*, the *Muſcovites*, the *Armenians*, the *Jacobites*, *Syrians*, *Copties*, *Abaſſines*, the *Proteſtants*, *&c.* as having departed from, or corrupted the firſt Tradition? And how *ſmall a* part of the *Univerſality* of Chriſtians are the *Papiſts*? And if the *greater* part of Chriſtians may ſo forſake the Apoſtolical Tradition, why may not the Pope of *Rome* and his Council? How ſhall we be ſure of their exemption from ſuch danger? You tell us over and over of our receiving this and that from our Fathers and Grand-Fathers? And is that a certain Proof that it is Apoſtolical? Why is it not ſo then with all the reſt, the *Abaſſines*, the *Armenians*, *&c.* and the Majority of Chriſtians? But of this I have ſpoken in the former Treatiſe.

5. And there I have deſired you to tell us, whether your *Grandfather*, or *his Prieſt*, was *Infallible*? If yea, how came he by it more than *all thoſe Churches*? If not, do you not delude your Relations, by drawing them to build

their Faith on a fallible man, or upon nothing? Your Relations were not at the Council of *Trent*, or *Florence*, or *Laterane*: How shall they be sure what the Pope and Council agreed on? What Foundation, but the words of your Priest or Grandfather, have you for your assurance? May not one of your Priests lye as well as all the *Greek*, *Abassine*, *&c.* Churches? When Pope *Cæleſtine* himself falsly urged the *Nicene* Council for Appeals to *Rome*, contrary to *Auguſtine* and the *Carthage* Council? Either tell your Readers plainly, that it's *you*, and such *as you*, that are the *Infallible Foundation* of their Faith; or bid them stay, and not go your way, till they are certain what the Pope and his Council say; and that he is a true Pope, and it a true Council, and that they are more Infallible than the major part of Christians. And our Faith can be no stronger than the weakest necessary *medium* of it, from whence it must arise.

6. I have said so much of this in a small Book, called, [*The certainty of Christianity without Popery*,] which I intreat you impartially to peruse, where I have also shewed the utter uncertainty that Popery would reduce our Christianity to; that I will now only tell you, that after your talk of Tradition, and Church, and Fathers, and Grandfathers, if we had not much more *testimony of Tradition* for our Religion than you have for Popery, we should think our Faith were very lame. Compare ours with yours: 1. Yours is *A pretended Authoritative determination*, which rests upon a supposed *Inspiration* of some Persons, by virtue of a special Priviledge peculiar to themselves. 2. It is the Tradition of the *minor part* of Christians against the *major*. 3. It rests on the pretended *Infallibility* of a *Pope*, *which great General Councils* have said may be a *Heretick*, and have deposed divers

as

as Hereticks, and worse: And upon the Infallibility of *General Councils*, which by Popes and other Councils are pronounced fallible, unless confirmed by a Pope (who may be a Heretick.) 4. It rests upon a Foundation (*viz.* the Popes Divine Right of Primacy and Infallibility) which is expresly denyed by two of the first four great General Councils, approved to this day; *viz.* that of *Calcedon* reciting the sense of that of *Constantinople* against the said Divine right, affirming, that the *Popes Primacy was given him by the Fathers, because* Rome *was the Imperial Seat.* 5. It rests upon an Authority (of Popes and General Councils,) which being at first but the *Clergie* of *one Empire*, hath thence claimed the same Power over *all the Christian World*, which they had got in the Dominions of *one Prince.* 6. It rests on a Claim downright contradictory to it self, as aforesaid, *viz.* That we must believe that the Pope hath this Power and Infallibility given him and his Councils, by Christ and his Gospel, before we can believe that there is a Christ and a Gospel authorized and true.

Now our Tradition is this: For all the *Essentials* of our Religion, the Sacramental Covenant, and the three expository *Symbols*, we have the currant Tradition both of the Papists and all the rest of the Christian World: Yea, that *every Book* that we call Canonical is the true Word of God, not only the Papists but almost all the Christian World confess: And, *de facto*, that these *Books* came down from the Apostles, at least that the Gospel was preached by them, we have the Testimony also of Enemies and Persecutors. And are not all these more than the Testimony of one *Sect* alone? 2. And in this we have as much to confirm us as you have, of the *wisdom, piety, care of the Church* to *preserve* the Gospel, and much

much more too; for we have the *Piety* of *all the Churches* to plead, and not *your Sect alone*: And we undertake to prove such a *moral Infallibility* as is also *Natural, viz.* That Mans *Nature* and *Interests* supposed, it is no more possible for so many Persons and Nations of cross Interests to have agreed in their Testimony for the Gospel, than for all the contentious Lawyers in the Land to have agreed falsly to inform us, that our Statutes were made by such Kings and Parliaments. But a domineering Faction alone might easilier have deceived men.

3. Yea, even as to *Christs Promise*, we can better prove that the *Universal Church*, or *Body of Christians*, shall *never lose the Faith*, than you can prove it of *Rome alone*, or the *Papal Sect*. *Bellarmine* himself dare not say, that *Rome* shall not cease to be the seat of the *Papacy*, or shall not be utterly destroyed. And then how can there be a *Bishop of Rome*, when there is no *Rome*? But you'll say, that if he dwell at *Avignion*, he may be *called Bishop of Rome*? But if he be *called so* when *he is not so*, at least when there is *no Rome*, or *no Christian Church there*, sure a *false Name* is not an Essential part of our Religion. If you say, that at *Avignion*, or *Ravenna*, or *Vienna*, he may be S. *Peter*'s Successor, and so the Universal Monarch still. I answer, Then it seems that the Council of *Calcedon*, as afore-cited, was in the right, (that *Romes Privilege was given by the Fathers, because it was the Imperial Seat:*) And so that the Pope is not S. *Peter*'s Successor, *eo nomine*, because *he is Bishop of Rome*. But if the Bishop of *Avignion*, or *Vienna*, might become S. *Peter*'s Successor (who never was Bishop there,) how shall we know that the Bishop of *Rome* is his Successor *now*? We have hitherto had no better means to prove it, and deceive the World, than by saying that S. *Peter* dyed Bishop

of

of *Rome*, where the Pope is Bishop: But S. *Peter* dyed not Bishop of *Avignion*. If the *Place* prove not the *Succession*, tell us, if you can, what doth? Is it the *Election*? By whom? Who are those men that have the Power of chusing S. *Peter* a Successor? You know, I suppose, that the Pope hath been chosen, 1. Sometime by the People, (witness the blood-shed at the choice of *Damasus* in the Church:) 2. Sometime by the People, and the Neighbour Ordaining Bishops: 3. Sometime by a Synod: 4. Sometime by the Emperours: 5. And lastly, by the *Roman* Cardinals. If any of these may chuse, then we may have four or five lawful Popes, chosen four or five several ways, at once. If only one of these have the Power, S. *Peter* had no Successors under all the other Elections. So that the Claim will fall rather to *Antioch* than to *Avignion*, or any other Town, because they say it was S. *Peter*'s first Bishoprick, from which he removed for a greater. If you are driven with poor Mr. *Johnson*, alias, *Terret*, to say, that *Any way will serve which serveth for the truth of an Election of Princes, &c.* then still we may have four Popes at least. I doubt you must be forced to say as some, that it is the *acceptance of the Universal Church*, which must prove who is the *Universal Monarch*. 1. But some must be *Electors*, before it comes to *acceptance*. And who hath the Power of *Electing*? And 2. what if now the major part of the Church should prefer the Bishop of *Constantinople*? I hope you are not so ignorant of Cosmography as not to know that the *Greek* Church when they first preferred the Bishop of *Const.* was far greater than the *Latine*. 3. And I suppose you know that it is not near half the Christian World that now accepteth of the Pope as their Governour. 4. And I pray you do but get the Pope to suspend his claim till *the Church Universal*

verſal accept him, and we ſhall not be troubled with him: For how ſhall they ſignifie their acceptance? If in a General Council, you know how they of *Conſtance*, *Baſil*, and *Piſa*, are reviled by the Pope and thoſe that now go for your Church, for pretending to a power to depoſe and chuſe Popes; and how *Eugenius* the fourth prevailed againſt ſuch a Depoſition. And if theſe Councils were not your Univerſal Church repreſentative, where ſhall we think to find it?

In ſum, we have the *Tradition* of a Church as *big as three of the* Roman *for all our Religion*; and of *all the* Roman *Church* it ſelf; beſides the Confeſſion of the *Enemies* of the Church, Pagans, Infidels, Mahometans, Jews, and Hereticks; we have not one word that's part of our Religion, which your ſelves confeſs not to be true: We believe that the *Faith of the Univerſal Church ſhall never fail*, nor the Gates of Hell prevail againſt it: And ſo you ſee that we may far better tell how Infallibly we have received our Religion from our Forefathers, than you can do of yours: But we believe not that this Univerſal Church hath any *Head* but *Chriſt*; no Humane Vicarious Monarch or Governour of all the World: We believe that Men muſt Believe in Chriſt before they can know that the Pope is his Vicar, if it had been true: We know, as ſure as Hiſtory can tell us, that the Pope's firſt Primacy, and the reſt of the Patriarchates were but the Humane Ordinances of the Clergie of one Empire, and not of the whole Chriſtian World. And we know not (nor you) but *Rome* and its Church and Biſhop, may yet all ceaſe together.

But you make me moſt admire at you, that (in this Book alſo) you tell your Relations, and other Readers, of the *uncertainty of notice by Books* in Compariſon of

Con-

converſe and *talk* with thoſe of your *preſent Party*; yea that your *own Religion* is not to be known by *Books*, as being lyable to be miſunderſtood, ſo well as by talking with Papiſts, and asking them what is their Faith or Religion. Sir, I judge by your Stile that you are a man of zeal and conſcience in your way, and therefore that you write not this fraudulently againſt your conſcience. Sure then you muſt needs be a man of more than ordinary ignorance, that can believe what you ſay. 1. Is it your *Objective* or your *Subjective* Faith that we are diſputing of? If it be not the *Rule* and *Object* of your Faith, every man indeed may tell us what *he believeth himſelf*, but no man can tell us what *another* believeth. And then you have as many Religions as men; for every man hath one of his own, and no two men in the world know and believe juſt all the ſame things, neither more nor leſs: And what ſhall thoſe of us think of your Religion then, who find that one of you affirmeth what another denyeth? For inſtance, A worthy Perſon of your Religion affirmed to me, that notwithſtanding the Fifth Commandment [*Honour thy Father and Mother*,] a Mother hath not any Governing Power over a *Child*, nor the *Child* oweth any obedience to the Mother, during the Fathers life, becauſe it were confuſion were there more Governours in a Houſe than one, though ſubordinate one to the other. Is this your common Judgment? May I ſay therefore that this is other mens belief? You know that when we alledge the ſayings of your moſt Learned Writers, we are ordinarily told, that it is not the judgment of particular Doctors, but of the Church in Councils, which we muſt call your Churches Judgment. You undertake not to juſtifie any more. And if I talk with

any of my Neighbours and ask him what he believeth, have I any more than a single Doctors opinion? Is his Answer, the Faith of your Church? But would you have any one past seven years old believe you, that *writing* is of no more use to Memory for conservation of Antiquities? when God would not trust his *Ten Commandments* to the Peoples *Memories*, but would write them in Stone, and put them in the Arke, (which you have so little skill in Antiquity as to say here was the *first writing*: Sure if you will read your Jesuite *Euseb. Nirembergius de Antiqu. scripturæ* you will not say that your Grand-Father taught you truly that Opinion as the Tradition of the Church.) Why do *you write* to your own Relations, if writing be so un-intelligible? Could the *Bible* have been kept as well in Memory as by *Writings*? Why were the Gospels written then? Do you go to *Tradition*, or to *Books*, to decide any Controversie now of the various readings? Did Pope *Clem.* 8. and *Sixtus* 5. reform the vulgar *Latine* by *Memory* or by *Books*? Pope *Pius*'s *Trent* Oath sweareth Men to Interpret Scripture according to the consent of the Fathers: Do any of your Doctors know how that is by *Memory and Oral Tradition*, or by *Books*? Did *Possevine*, and *Sixtus Senensis*, and such others, Correct Books by Oral Tradition, or by Books? Did *Celestine* and the *Carthage* Council debate the Case of the *Nicene* Canon (a narrow Instance which Memory might have served for) out of Mens *Memories*, or out of *written Records*? Why doth *Turrian* bring us out new Forged Canons, and why do the Copies of many Councils differ in the recital of Canons, if Memory and Universal un-written Tradition can reconcile the difference? Was the *Athenian* Philosophy propagated and preserved better by Memory, or by Books? Why is

not

not the Stoicks,and Epicureans,and others,as fully known now as *Aristotles* and *Plato's*, if Memory without Books could have done? Have you as full notice now of the Acts of *James*, *John*, *Matthew*, *Thomas*, *Bartholomew*, *&c.* without Book, as you have of *Paul's* by the Book? Is memory sufficient to have preserved to us the Statutes of the Land, without Books and Records? Yea, or the Common-Law without any Records or Book Cases? Why are all your Councils written? and all the Decretals? to say nothing of the Civil *Roman* Laws, Institutes, Pandects, and Digests. Can you decide the Controversies about the Decretals, published by *Isidore Mercator*, by Tradition? What are all your Libraries for at the *Vatican*, *Florence*, *Paris*, and in each Learned Mans House, if Books be so useless and unintelligible? If one of your Relations ask you, what is in the Council of *Trent*, *Florence*, *Laterane*, and so upward, can you tell him fully without Book by Tradition? And are not these Councils your very Religion? Doth every Papist Neighbour carry them all in his brain, more certainly than in Books? Or could your Grandfather and Grandmother have told us more certainly what is in them, than *Crab*, *Surius*, *Binius*, *Baronius*, *Justellus*, *Albaspinæus*, *Petavius*, *Sirmondus*, *&c.* could do? Or is all left uncertain because it is written?

Through Gods Mercy our Essentials, and somewhat more, are delivered certainly down to us by two hands, by Oral and Practical Tradition, and by the Scripture, because they lye in a narrow room. But yet if you had the front to tell the World, that your immutable Church hath never changed the Creed it self, we could not believe you, because *Books* contradict you. Tradition from your Great Grandfather cannot assure us that [*Filioq*,]

was in the Creed from the days of the Apoſtles: Nor that [*the Holy Catholick Church, the Communion of Saints,*] and the other words mentioned in *Voſſius*, and *Uſher de Symbolis*, were in ſo long: Nor that the *Greeks* added no words to their Creed at *Nice*, nor afterward at *Conſtantinople*, in General Councils; nor that all S. *Hilaries* outcry againſt Creeds was in vain. Nor can Tradition without Book yet aſſure us, what were the very words of the Creed uſed commonly by the *Greeks*, immediately before the *Nicene* Council; nor who wrote that aſcribed to *Athanaſius*: Nor among the various *Formula's* of that called the Apoſtles, found, as aforeſaid, in *Irenæus*, *Tertullian*, *Epiphanius*, *Ruffinus*, *&c.* which of them was in conſtant uſe; or whether liberty of ſuch alteration of words was not then uſed.

And no Unwritten Report of your Grandfather can aſſure us, that your Maſs-Book or Liturgy was the ſame in the Apoſtles days as it is now; nor that it was for 600 years the ſame in all the Churches of one Empire; and that every Biſhop had not power to uſe what Liturgy he pleaſed, in his own City or *Parochia*: Nor can your Tradition aſſure us, that what the Father and Grandfather uſed, was uſed from the Apoſtles, when the Church of *Neocæſarea* clamoured at S. *Baſil* for his ſingularity and innovations, and S. *Baſil* retorts on them, that they at *Neocæſarea* had ſcarce left any thing unchanged: I hope this is not the leſs credible becauſe *Baſil* hath *written* it.

At leaſt, I pray hereafter give over your ill practice of leading ſimple Readers into a Wood of *Church-Hiſtory*, to loſe them and the Queſtion there among a multitude of Citations of old Books, when you know not what elſe to ſay (as *William Johnſon* did,) becauſe

becauſe there the ignorant know nothing themſelves, but may as well believe the Affirmer as the Denyer; and at leaſt the diverſion to voluminous Controverſies about particular mens words may hide your Errours. Do not reſolve all the Controverſie, yea the Faith of your Followers, into a multitude of *Books* of *Councils* and *Fathers* which they never ſaw. And do not take ſo much care to corrupt and alter Books, for your intereſt, as inſtances and your *Indices Expurg.* tell us you have done. Reſolve without Book the Controverſie about your great *Laterane* Council, whether Dr. *Taylor*, Dr. *Pierſon*, Dr. *Gunning*, (and Biſhop *Couſins* lately) that ſay *Innocent.* 3. made and publiſhed the Canons, and the Council did not conſent to them, be in the right, or rather they that anſwered Dr. *Pierſon* and Dr. *Gunning*, and indeed your Church, which holds the contrary (which Mr. *Dodwell* ſeemeth to me lately to have fully proved, in his Book about tolerating Papiſts.)

Nay why may we not expect that you lay by your Book Catechiſms, your Office Books, your Controverſie Books, and teach your People all without Book?

But by this Counſel to your Relations, you fully ſhew that you would have them to have no certainty at all, either what Chriſtianity is, or what Popery is. For they ſhall never ſpeak with the *Univerſal Church*, or with a *General Council*, while they live: And all their Neighbours, to whom you ſend them, are fallible Perſons. I ſuppoſe you one of the chief of them, and alas, how fallible you are, you have in two Writings groſly ſhewed.

Having ſaid thus much more, to ſhew that your Foundation is Sand, who ſend us from *Books* to our Grandfathers, as infallible; and that this is no better a ground than

than the *Abaſſines*, *Greeks*, and others, may build on as well as you; and that we our ſelves have a far ſurer and Univerſal Tradition than the Papacy hath, and have your own conſent to every word of our Objective Religion, I now proceed to conſider of your Character of Parties.

CHAP. II.

YOU deſcribe to us four ſuppoſed Parties. I. The *Puritan*. II. The *Prelatical Proteſtant*, (whom your *Fitz-Simmons* calleth, The *Formaliſt*.) III. The *Papiſt*, as you ſuppoſe us *falſly to deſcribe him*. IV. The *Papiſt*, as you ſuppoſe him *truly deſcribed*, whom you call *The Apoſtolical Chriſtian*. In all which you ſhew that you are far from Infallibility, and a man unfit for your Relations to truſt in ſo great a Caſe.

I. I confeſs you give the *Puritan* a very laudable deſcription, in compariſon of the *Prelatiſt Proteſtant*, and the *feigned Papiſt*. And you tell us, that you were once a Puritan your ſelf, and you own ſtill that which you deſcribe as *Puritaniſm*, only adding *Popery* to it, which you think it wants. I confeſs you ſpeak incomparably more honourably and charitably of *Puritans*, than ſome malicious intereſſed Perſons, of their own Proteſtant Profeſſion will do. But,

1. You deal not informingly, in your *deſcribing* a *Puritan*, before you *diſtinguiſh* that *ambiguous* ill-made word. It hath three common acceptions among us at leaſt.

Firſt, The *ancienteſt*, as it ſignifieth the old or later *Cathariſts*,

Cathariſts, who held that they *were perfect* (if they are not belyed:) And none come nearer theſe than the Papiſts and Quakers, certainly *Proteſtants* are far from it.

Secondly, the *old Non-conformiſts* had the name of *Puritanes* put on them, by thoſe that were againſt them: For what reaſon, I leave them to anſwer to God.

Thirdly, and becauſe theſe *Non-conformiſts* lived *ſtrictly*, and were for much preaching, and praying, and holy conference, and ſpending the Lords-day in holy Exerciſes, and ſerious diligence in working out our Salvation, and were ſharp againſt drunkenneſs, ſwearing, and ſuch other ſins, therefore the *vulgar Rabble* of vicious ones, that durſt not rail at Piety under the name of Piety, took the advantage of the Biſhops diſpleaſure at the Non-conformiſts, and of the name *Puritane*, and put that name upon all Chriſtians among them, that were *notably ſerious in practical Godlineſs*, perſwading themſelves that they were all but *Hypocrites*: And ſo the name among the *vulgar Rabble* grew common to *godly Conformiſts and Non-conformiſts*: And as if *loquendum cum vulgo* had been a Law, by this means the Devil did more hurt both to *godlineſs* (rendring it among the vulgar to be but odious Hypocriſie and Singularity) and to *Epiſcopacy* (making Multitudes that diſliked the wickedneſs of the Rabble, to think that all this came from the Biſhops,) and it did more to advance and honour the *Non-conformiſts*, (becauſe the name was formerly *theirs* as ſuch) than by any one thing that I remember in all my younger days. This the godly Conformiſts grievouſly complained of, (as Biſhop *Downame* in his *Spittle Sermon*, called *Abrahams Tryal*, and Mr. *Robert Bolton*, who ſaith, that he *believeth that never poor perſecuted Word paſſed through the Mouths of wicked Men with more bitter ſcorn, ſince Ma-*

lice

lice firſt entred into the Heart of Man:] Really the permitting of the common Rabble of all the debauched Sinners of the Land to make ſerious godlineſs a common ſcorn under the name of Puritaniſme, had as great a hand as any thing I know in all our Confuſions.

Fourthly, and it added Fuel to the Fire when ſome brought up a fourth ſence of the Word (ſome ſay, *Mar. Ant. de Dom. Spalatenſis* was the inventor of it,) and that was *Doctrinal Puritanes*, by which name they underſtood thoſe by ſome called *Calviniſts*, by others *Anti-Arminians*, who held the Doctrine of your Dominicans, or of the Janſeniſts.

Now who can well tell which of theſe ſorts of Puritanes you *were*, and *talk of*, while you Characterize the *ſecond ſort*, as well as the *firſt*, and yet diſtinguiſh them from *Prelatick Proteſtants*?

2. But which ever it is, obſerve here that you own the *Puritanes Religion* ſtill, and ſay, [*I have not ſo much left Puritaniſm, as Prelaticks call it, as added that to it wherein I found it come ſhort of the holy Apoſtles Doctrine and Inſtitutions*,] *p.* 1. And when you have deſcribed the Puritane as one ſeriouſly conſcionable and regardful of his Salvation, (at large) you add, [*If this be to be a Puritane, would to God all the World were Puritanes! I am ſo far from being Converted from thus much of a Puritane, that I moſt heartily wiſh I could Convert all the World to it.*]

3. But yet your deſcription of him is ſo very falſe, that I may conclude when you turned, as you think, from being a meer Puritane to be a Papiſt, you never knew what a *Puritane is*, nor indeed ever were a *Puritane* your ſelf, unleſs you take the word as fitted to your ſelf, and ſuch as you.

If

If you had meant by a *Puritane* a meer *Non-conformiſt* as ſuch, you would not ſo laudably have deſcribed the work of God upon his Soul and Life as you have done: For if moſt Non-conformiſts be ſuch, yet ſo are many others as well as they. And it's eaſie to ſee what a deceitful courſe it is to take up a name of many ſignifications, and ſuch as ſignifieth no different Religion at all, as to any one Article of Faith, nor any more difference in, or about Religion, than ſuch as is among moſt Chriſtian Churches; and much leſs than is among your ſelves.

Beſides that the plainer name of a *Non-conformiſt* is of no determinate nor certain ſignification, ſave only in general to notifie one that Conformeth not to all that is impoſed on him; but *what that is*, the *name* doth not ſignifie.

A *Non-conformiſt* in *Scotland* is one thing, in *England* another thing, as the Impoſitions are different. Non-conformity twenty years ago, or fourty years, was one thing. Non-conformity ſince 1662. is quite another thing. And Non-conformiſts differ among themſelves: If twenty things be impoſed as neceſſary to the Miniſtry, he is a Non-conformiſt who conſenteth but to nineteen of them; and ſo is he that conſenteth but to eighteen, or to ſeventeen, or to ſixteen, and ſo on, as well as he that conſenteth to none of them. And that there is ſo much difference among them is no wonder to them, nor any conſiderate Man; for they hold Chriſtian Love and Communion with thoſe that agree with them in the foreſaid common Principles and Practice of Chriſtianity, (as far as they require not them to ſin:) And they are not of a different Religion from every one that *faſteth not on Fridays*, or *Saints Vigils*, *&c.* as you ſeem to be, nor

from every one that doth so; nor from every one that thinketh not in every thing as they think, or that prayeth in other words than they; for no two Men in the World should on such Terms be of one Religion: They believe *Socrates* and *Sozomen*, who tell us of the great diversity of Rites and Orders in the ancient Churches, which all consisted with the same Religion, Faith, and Love. They abhor the Principle of hating, persecuting, yea and separating from one another for such differences as will unavoidably adhere to the imperfect condition of Christians here on Earth.

At this time in *England* a considerable part (if not the far greatest) of the *silenced Ministers* are for the *Primitive Episcopacy*, and *some Liturgie*, as you may see in their offer of A. Bishop *Usher's Reduction* to the King, and their desires of a *reformed Liturgie*. Among the *old Non-conformists*, there were divers degrees: such as Dr. *Reynolds*, Mr. *Perkins*, Dr. *Humfrey*, *Paul Bayn*, *&c.* did yield to more than some others could do. How can you tell them by the name of a *Puritane*, what to charge any single Person with?

But it seemeth you take their *Non-conformity in General*, and their *temper of mind and life together*. But then you greatly wrong them, and seem not at all to know what their Religion is.

There are two things which you say they mistake in: 1. Their Doctrine of *Imputed Righteousness*, *and the Covenant*, *and not solicitously endeavouring after the acquisition of Virtue*, because they trust to the *Imputed Righteousness*;] your words are too large to recite: You partly here unworthily injure them by ascribing to them the very *opinions* and *words* of the *Antinomians*, whom they have better confuted than ever you did. And as to their Doctrine

ctrine of *Imputed Righteouſneſs*, even *Bellarmine* in one ſenſe owneth it: And whether our ſenſe be found I provoke you to try particularly by your peruſal of my own Writings on that Subject, eſpecially a late *Treatiſe* of [*Juſtifying Righteouſneſs* and Imputation,] and a Treatiſe called [*Catholick Theologie*:] In which if there be nothing which you *dare* or *can* confute, judge whether your meer deriſion of [*Imputative Righteouſneſs*] be not deluſory: If you dare ſay, that *you truſt not to Chriſts Sacrifice, and meritorious perfect righteouſneſs*, as procuring you *pardon and life*, (*Jus ad Impunitatem & Regnum Cælorum*,) enjoy your ſelf-confidence while you can. But if you ſay in this *as we*, then make publick Confeſſion of the injury of your reproach of ſuch *Imputed Righteouſneſs*, as you truſt your ſalvation upon your ſelf.

I imagine you will ſay, that *my judgment* is no certain ſignification of the judgment of the Puritans; for I am *ſingular*, and therefore what I ſay in theſe Books is no proof of the ſenſe of the Non-conforming Puritans. But, 1. *my* judgment of their ſenſe is as good as *yours*. 2. Do you know of any one Nonconformiſt that hath publiſhed any diſſent to what I have written? (Dr. *Tully* was a *Conformiſt*.) 3. You profeſs (before) to borrow the name [*Puritan*] from the *Prelatiſts*. And I have this to ſay for my Authority in declaring the ſenſe of Puritans, that one or more (whoſe *genius* is of kin to the *Roman*, but far *leſs mild* than *yours*) who are Prelatical or ſuper-Prelatical, have about 17 years ago (being Maſters of that Language) branded me with the Name of [*Purus putus Puritanus, & qui totum Puritaniſmum totus ſpirat.*] (The *Pſeudo-Tilenus* hath juſt the ſame ſtile as the late *Unmasker of the Presbyterians*, *who revileth modeſt, judicious, pious, and peaceable* Fl. *Corbet*, and in the moſt ingenious ſtrain of

wrath and malice doth valiantly militate againſt *Love.*) Therefore Prelatiſts being Judges, I may as credibly as another tell you what is the *Puritan Judgment.*

2. Your ſecond accuſation of the Puritan is, that [*He begins to quarrel with all external Worſhip and Ceremonies.*] But this is alſo ſpoken ignorantly and untruly: You before miſtook the *Antinomian* for the *Puritan*, and here you ſeem to take the *Separatiſt* for the *Puritan.* Read the Reformed Liturgy, and other Papers offered at the *Savoy* to the Biſhops, and you may ſee that though they are not for *ſilencing*, *excommunicating*, and *damning men* for a *Ceremony*, nor for making as many Religions, as there are differences about Ceremonies, yet they are for doing all things to edification, decently and in order; and for *external* as well as *internal* Worſhip of God: As knowing that the *Body* is his, and made to Worſhip him as well as the *Soul*, and therefore ſhould fall down and *kneel* before him, and reverently and holily behave it ſelf in his Service.

You ſay, p. 5. "[*He is much confirmed in this his imagi-*
"*nation, by conſidering the open profaneneſs, and little*
"*ſenſe of God, he obſerveth generally in zealous Confor-*
"*miſts. And on the other ſide he taketh notice of his Bre-*
"*thren the Non-conformiſts, that they are generally free*
"*from open and ſcandalous ſins, and at leaſt ſigh and breath*
"*after interior ſpirit and devotion, which certainly muſt*
"*be that muſt give us a title to Heaven, rather than a few*
"*Cringes, and exterior Verbal Devotions, which any one*
"*though never ſo prophane may eaſily exerciſe.*]

1. But do you not here and in your former deſcription quite contradict your ſelf, when you charge them as neglecting *inherent righteouſneſs*?

2. We are not ſo fooliſh as not to know, that the unreverent

reverent hypocritical abuſe of Gods external Worſhip, by others whoſoever, will not excuſe us for neglecting it, Of the Conformiſts we muſt ſpeak anon.

3. By the way I would you could impartially conſider, if the Puritans be ſo good men, as you fairly confeſs them to be, what the reaſon is that Papiſts generally are far more fiery againſt them than againſt thoſe whom you ſpeak ſo meanly of as *Prelatical Proteſtants*? Remember how your Writer after the *London* Fire, anſwered by Dr. *Lloid*, did flatter theſe as more ſuitable to the Papiſts *genius* in compariſon of the Puritans: And the *Unmasker* againſt *J. Corbet* will tell you out of *Watſon* (an honourable Witneſs hanged for Treaſon in *Cobham*'s, *&c.* Conſpiracy) how bad the Puritans are, (comparing them with the Jeſuites:) And if your Laws took place in *England*, what abundance of theſe Puritans would you make Bonfires of? yea your own Relations were not like to ſcape you. They have told me to my face, how quickly they would otherwiſe ſilence me than the Prelates do, if I were in their power. And the Decrees *De Hæreticis comburendis & exterminandis* more fully tell it us. Yea, whence is it, that moſt certain experience proveth it, that by how much the nearer any Proteſtants genius is to the Papiſts, by ſo much the more *bloody*, *cruel*, *malicious*, or *ſlanderous* and *unmerciful* he is to the *Puritanes*?

You'll ſay for both, that it is becauſe the *Puritans are moſt againſt them, and Intereſt ruleth the world.* But I anſwer, 1. God's Intereſt is higheſt with every true Chriſtian: 2. I confeſs it's true, that Puritans are moſt againſt Popery: But truly as far as I have been acquainted with them, they are not moſt againſt your *Perſons*, nor would have any injuſtice or cruelty exerciſed againſt you: But the fear of your *Faggots*, or *Powder-Plots*, and

ſuch

such *Massacres* as were in *France*, (of Thirty Thousand, or Forty Thousand;) or in *Ireland*, (of Two Hundred Thousand,) hath made them think your *Power* inconsistent with their safety: 3. And you must remember that the *Positive Additions* of the Church of *Rome*, are in the Judgment of the Puritans very great sins: But you have truly no charge against the Puritans, for any one Article of their Religion; but only for *not receiving*, and for *protesting against your Additions*.

4. But I perceive, *p.* 5. your Instances of their defectiveness are, that they are not for [" *fasting days, particular Garments for Priests, set Forms, Christmas-day, Good-Friday, Ascension, Whitsuntide*, &c. *which they take for meer Humane inventions and Will-worship; Because they think that the New Testament was written to instruct us Christians in the whold Body of Gospel-worship, &c.*

But you are best prove this only by telling us that you know some persons of that mind: And when you have done, I will demand your Proof that those Persons are *no more* than Puritans. They have oft told you that their judgment is, that for all that substance of God's Worship which is of Universal necessity to the Church, and is of Divine Institution, the holy Scripture is a sufficient Rule: But that very many Circumstances and outward Acts have in Scripture but a General Law (that they be all done to edification, decently, orderly, in Concord, *&c.*) and it is left to Humane Prudence to order them by such Rules: We condemn no one that useth holy Fasts or Feasts, but think them needful: We judge not those that celebrate the Memorial of God's great Mercies to his Church, by giving him thanks for the holy Life and Doctrine of his Eminent Saints, *&c.* But will you plainly have our judgment? We

We think Saint *Paul* was in the right that taught the Church of *Rome* it self, both the *Rulers* and the Flocks, that they must neither *judge* nor *despise* each other for differences about Meats and Days, but *receive each other* (to Communion notwithstanding such differences) as *Christ received us*, *Rom.* 14. and 15. And we will not believe your Grand-Father, nor Great-Grand-Father, if they told us that the Apostles by Tradition did institute Holy-days, and Vigils for St. *Tecla*, or St. *Bridgit*, or St. *Thomas Becket*, or any that were not born till they were dead: And any one *Day* or *Order* which you truly prove to us that the *Apostles* by Tradition ordained for the *Universal Church*, we profess our selves ready and resolved to obey.

But if you plead not *Tradition* for any of *these things*, but the *Churches Commands*, (as you must do, or be singular, or ashamed;) here you come to the quick of our difference: 1. We know not of any *Universal Visarious Law-giver* under Christ that hath any power to make Laws to the Universal Church throughout the World: and we dare not own any such *Usurper* lest we be guilty of Treason against the only Head of the whole Church.

2. We know not of any power that the chief Bishop in the *Roman* Empire hath over other Empires, Kingdomes, or Churches.

3. But to our own *true Pastors* which are set over us according to Christ's order and his Apostles recorded in Scripture, we Puritanes will submit in all such Circumstantials, as aforesaid, which are left to their prudent determination, not putting us on any sin.

But, 4. We detest making such things as you here name to be taken for the Characters of *distinct Religions*, or *distinct Churches*, as if we might not with Love, Peace, and Christian Communion, differ about a Garment, a

Holy-

Holy-day, Faſt, or Vigil. Thus far then you ſeem not to know what a meer Puritan is.

II. But, Sir, I have much more than all theſe little things againſt your Deſcription of a Puritane: I plainly perceive in your greateſt praiſes of him, that you know not what his very Religion it ſelf is; or elſe you would never deſcribe him as only taken up with *fears and cares, and good deſires to be better*, having yet *greedy deſires of the things of the World*, without any mention of the *Love of God above all*, and of his *Neighbour*, and a *holy and heavenly Mind and Life*, with *ſelf-denyal, mortification* of the *Fleſh*, &c.

Either you judge of a *Puritane* by what you were *your ſelf*, or by what your *acquaintance* were, or by what they *commommonly profeſs* to be their Religion.

For the firſt you have no reaſon: It followeth not that *they* have no better a Religion, becauſe *you* had no better.

For the ſecond you had no reaſon: For it's ten to one you knew not the hearts of your acquaintance, ſo well as to be able to know that they had not the *Love of God, &c.* And if you were ſo unhappy in your acquaintance, what's that to other Men?

Thirdly, Therefore as you look that your own Religion ſhould be deſcribed, not as we find it in this or that man, but as your Church profeſſeth it, ſo do we: And I have told you before what our Religion is. I have the more boldneſs in ſpeaking the ſenſe of others, as I ſaid, both becauſe I am as aforeſaid ſtigmatized for a *total Puritan*, and becauſe the generality of all of them of my acquaintance as far as I can diſcern are of this mind.

A *Puritan* then, as the Word is commonly taken by the Rabble, is a *ſerious Chriſtian Proteſtant, who truly believeth and practiſeth what he doth profeſs*, and doth not mortifie

that Profeſſion which ſhould help to mortifie his Sin: His Religion is, to be underſtandingly and ſincerely devoted in the Sacramental Covenant to God the Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt; renouncing the Vanities of the World, the Luſts of the Fleſh, and the Deluſions of the Devil: He believeth that all that truly conſent to this Covenant, have a right, and part, in, and to, the Love of God the Father, the Grace of the Son, and the Communion of the Holy Choſt; and that he that hath the Son hath Life, Pardon, Adoption, Juſtification, and Right to Life Eternal; and that this Right is continued, he performing his Covenant, and continuing in that Faith which worketh by Love, and not living impenitently in ſin, but ſincerely obeying God his Father, Saviour, and Sanctifier: He taketh the *fear* of Gods Juſtice, and godly Sorrow, to be but the lower ſteps of Holineſs; but that the Kingdom of God is (not Meats and Days, but) Righteouſneſs, Peace, and Joy in the Holy Ghoſt; and that the Spirit of Chriſt, without which none are his, is not the Spirit of Bondage, but of Power, Love, and a ſound Mind; even a Spirit of holy LIFE, LIGHT, and LOVE, which are the Eſſentials of true Holineſs; and the Spirit of Adoption, and Supplication, cauſeth us with Love to cry to God, and truſt him as a Father: They take Chriſt to be the only Mediator between God and Man, whoſe ſufficient Sacrifice for Sin, and perfect Righteouſneſs, Habitual, Active, and Paſſive (as called) advanced in dignity by the Divine Nature, is the Meritorious cauſe of all their Mercies to Body and Soul, Remiſſion, Juſtification, Holineſs, and Glory: They put up all their Services, as into, and by, the Hand of Chriſt; and from his Mediatory Hand they expect all mercies: They take the Holy Ghoſt within them to be Chriſt's

Advocate and Witneſs to them of his Truth and Love; and their Witneſs, Earneſt, Seal, Pledge, and firſt Fruits of endleſs Life: They take Eternal Glory for their full Felicity, and this World, and Fleſh, (Pleaſure, Riches, and Honour,) to be ſo far uſeful as they ſignifie Gods Love, and further our Love and Service to him; but to be *Vanity* as ſeparated from God in our Hearts, and Enmity, or Miſchief, as Competitors, or as againſt him. In a word, Faith working by Supream Love and Obedience to God, and Brotherly Love to Man, by Honour to our Superiours, Juſtice to all; and by all the good that we can do in the World, and by Repentance for our Sins, patience in ſufferings, and by a Heavenly Mind, and Life, is the Sum of their Religion; or plainlier as is ſaid at firſt, The Goſpel-Covenant as expounded in the Creed, Lords-Prayer, and Decalogue, as the Summary of things to be believed, deſired, and practiſed; and the holy Scriptures as the full and comprehenſive Records of the Doctrine, Promiſes, and Laws of God, containing the Eſſentials, Integrals, and neceſſary Accidentals of Religion. This is the Chriſtian Religion, and the Puritan in queſtion is but the SERIOUS CHRISTIAN diſtinct from the HYPOCRITE, or dead Formaliſt.

But if you add *Non-conformity* to the ſenſe of the Word, and to his Character; ſo I need not tell you what the Impoſitions are which ſome deny Conformity to, as to Oaths, New-Covenants, Subſcriptions, Declarations, Practices, *&c.* which he proteſteth that he would never deny Conformity to, if after his beſt enquiry he did not believe that God forbiddeth it: (As you may ſee at large in their *Savoy Petition for Peace* to the Biſhops.) Theſe two it ſeems you join together; and what their Objective Religion is, I have better told you, than you have told

told your Relations. But as to the clearneſs of their Judgment in it, and the meaſure of their Practice of it, there are, I think, as various Degrees as there are Perſons, no two Men in the World being in all things juſt of the ſame Degree.

And now Sir give me leave patiently to ask you theſe two Queſtions: 1. Why would you by temerity go about to deceive your Relations, and other Readers, by talking to them againſt that which you did not underſtand? Even then, when you blame others as dealing ſo by the Papiſts? And why do you diſhonour your own Relations ſo, as to make ſo bad a Deſcription of them? Are they ſuch as have *no Love to God as God, no delight in Holineſs, no Heavenly Minds? nothing almoſt but fear and its effects*? Have they *ſtill the Flames of Concupiſcence*, and greedy *deſires of Money* and the *things of this Life*, *&c.* If it be not ſo, you ſhould not have told the World ſo of them: If it be ſo, I am ſorry for them: I ſuppoſe it is contrary to their profeſt Religion; and you may have the greater hopes to make them Papiſts?

II. What wonder is it that you that were no better a Puritan than you deſcribe, are turned Papiſt? You that profeſs you were a Puritan, muſt needs be judged to tell us what a one you were your ſelf, when you tell us what they are? Alas poor Man! How came you to be ſo falſe to your own Profeſſion, againſt your Baptiſmal Vows, as to keep ſo much of the World at your Heart, in greedy deſires after Money, and to have no more Love to God and Man? no more Righteouſneſs, Peace, and Joy in the Holy Ghoſt? Could you think that a Man could be ſaved without *Love and good Works*? Were you deluded by ſuch *Antinomian* conceits as you deſcribe, and took that for Puritaniſme? How elſe did you quiet your

Conſcience in ſuch a ſtate of Hypocriſie? If God and Holineſs had not your chief Love (as well as Fear) you were but an Hypocrite.

And here give me leave to repeat what I have oft written: What wonder is it at any Mans turning Papiſt? when according to your own Principles, no Proteſtant, Puritan, or other Chriſtian turneth Papiſt, that doth not thereby declare that he was a falſe-hearted Hypocrite before, and had no true Love to God in his Heart: And was not this your caſe? For, 1. You affirm that all Men that have true prevalent Love to God are in a ſtate of Grace, and have right to Salvation, (till they loſe it:) 2. You affirm that none of us are in a ſtate of Grace and Salvation, that are not of your Church, that is, the Subjects of the King, or Pope of *Rome*: 3. Therefore it followeth that you take none but ſuch Subjects or Members of your Church, to have the true prevalent Love of God. But you know that in our Chriſtian Covenant and Profeſſion we all take God for our God, the infinite and moſt amiable Good, our Father in Chriſt, and Love it ſelf, and that Faith working by Love is our Religion: *And if any Man*, ſaith Saint *Paul*, *love not the Lord Jeſus Chriſt, let him be Anathema Maranatha*: And he *that loveth the World, the Love of the Father is not in him*, 1 *Joh.* 2. 15. So that by turning Papiſt you confeſs that before you were no true Chriſtian, nor had any true Love to God and Godlineſs, nor to Jeſus Chriſt: And if ſo, you were a falſe-hearted Hypocrite: For as a Chriſtian you profeſt and Covenanted it. And what wonder then if God forſook you and gave you up to ſtrong deluſions, when you would not receive the Truth in the Love of it, that you might be ſaved, 2 *Theſ.* 2.

And note here, that if any Man know that he truly loveth

loveth God and Goodneſs, you tell him that he is none of thoſe that you perſwade to Popery: For you perſwade none to it, but thoſe that are ungodly Hypocrites, having no true Love of God within them.

But can you think, Sir, in good earneſt, that Popery tendeth more to fill Men with the Love of God, than our ſimple Chriſtianity doth? Is not Popery a Religion of Bondage and Servitude, conſiſting mainly in Terrour, and its ſuperſtitious effects? What are moſt of your Tasks of Pilgrimages, Penances, and abundance ſuch, but the effects of ſervile fear? The beſt of Religion next Heaven ſhould be that which is neareſt to Heaven. And do you think you can love God better in the *Fire* of Purgatory Torments, than if he took you unto Chriſt in Paradiſe? Could you love God better in this Life, if he tormented you in the Fire, than if he give you comfort by his mercies?

You ſay that the Puritan [*is made negligent* (by his truſt in Chriſt) *to adorn his Soul with Piety, Charity, Meekneſs, Patience, Humility, and other Chriſtian Vertues; partly thinking them impoſſible to be attained, partly deeming there is no abſolute neceſſity of them to his Salvation, he having nothing to do but to believe that Jeſus Chriſt hath done all for him.*] *Anſw.* I had hoped there had been few ſuch left in *England*: Even *Criſp* and *Saltmarſh*, were ſcarce ſo erroneous: And *were you* ſuch a one? O miſerable Man that was ſuch a Puritan! Who did bewitch you ſo groſly to contradict the whole Tenour of the Goſpel? It is juſt with God to leave you, to ſet now as light by the *Meritorious Righteouſneſs of Chriſt* as procuring you Pardon, Grace, and Glory, as you did then ſet by *Chriſtian Virtues, Piety, and Love*? But what if it was ſo with you, will that allow you to belie ſo many others? How many ſcore Volumes have the Puri-

tans

tans written which assert not only the possibility, but the absolute necessity of Piety, Charity, Humility, &c. without which none can see God, (Infants Case is not here medled with.) I know not one Person in all the Land, or World, that will not abhor, as false, what you here charge in common on the Puritans, unless he be a very gross Antinomian, or some grosser Heretick here unknown: Protestants, Puritans, Separatists, Anabaptists, yea, Quakers, all abhor it: And yet you feared not to put this in Print? Perhaps you will pretend for it the Doctrine of Justification by Faith alone? But they that say that Faith alone going first with Repentance, doth justifie them, by procuring the pardon of their sins, and their Union with Christ, do say that at the same moment of time it also sanctifieth them, by procuring from Christ the Spirit of Sanctification, giving them Love, Humility, Piety, &c. And that this is of absolute necessity to their Salvation, *Heb.* 12. 14. *Mat.* 18. 3. *Rom.* 8. 1. 6. 7. 13. So much of your false self-condemning description of a Puritan.

CHAP. III.

II. YOU next Characterize the *Prelatical Protestant*: Having said before *p.* 5. [*Their Preachers in their Sermons have little Life or Zeal; and seldom discourse of such Truths as are apt to awaken Mens Consciences, and make them lay to heart the great concern of the Salvation of their Souls. Or if they do at any time preach of Judgment, or of Hell, Repentance, or a New Life, they do it very*

very coldly and imperfectly, and seem to talk like Parrots, of what they have learnt by rote or out of others Books, and not what they have had any experience of in their hearts.] And *p. 6.* [*Generally speaking, (I wish it were a slander) Prelatick Protestants are very Prophane, and give no signs of any interiour trouble of Conscience: And if any of them begin to be heartily troubled for his sin, he is observed either to turn Fanatick or Papist.*]

Answ. If by a *Prelatick Protestant* you should unhandsomly mean only such as are *worldly Clergy-men*, like too many of your *Roman* Prelates and their Curates, who take Gain for Godliness, and who allow their Flesh, their Pride, their Covetousness, and Voluptuousness, and Sloth, to chuse their Religion; whose God is their Belly, who glory in their shame, and who mind Earthly things, and are Enemies to Cross-bearing; and through Enmity to those that are better than themselves, are Cross-imposers, and Persecutors, and Silencers, of sober faithful Ministers, because they cross their Pride and worldly Interest; such it's like may be no better Men than you describe them. But why should you take the Word in so narrow a sense?

But if by *Prelatick Protestants* you mean all such Protestants whose judgment is for Episcopacy, 1. You deceive, and I suppose are deceived, in your distinguishing these from *Non-conformists*: It's true that there are envious false-hearted Prelatists in the World, that make false names for their Brethren, to procure the belief of their false reports of them: And God will cut out the lying Tongue. But I will tell you the truth, whose malice soever is against it; there are *Episcopal* as well as *Presbyterian* and *Independent Non-conformists* now: Yea, divers that are against the late Wars of the Parliament, and

against.

againſt the Covenant, and never took it; and ſome that have been Souldiers for the King, and ſuffered for him: Yea ſo conſiderable is the number of them that are *Epiſcopal*, that in 1660. when the King called them to treat in order to agreement, they offered him *no other Form of Church Government, than A. Biſhop* Uſher's *Reduction*, in which not a *Pin of Honour*, nor one Farthing of *their Revenue* was deſired to be taken from Archbiſhops, Biſhops, Deans, Archdeacons; but only the Pariſh Miniſters enabled under them, to have done ſomewhat more that belongeth to their Office, inſtead of Lay-Chancellors, *&c. Moſt Non-conformiſts* of my acquaintance would be glad of the terms contained in the Kings Declaration about Eccleſiaſtical Affairs, where Biſhops and Archbiſhops are left as rich and high as they were before: So far are *Non-conformiſts* [*Epiſcopal Proteſtants.*]

2. And though *Conformity* be very much changed from what it was heretofore, *Epiſcopacy* is not. And I muſt tell you, that I do not think that the Chriſtian World hath more godly learned worthy Miniſters, than many of the Epiſcopal were heretofore. Do you know what men Biſhop *Jewel*, A. Biſhop *Grindall*, and many more of old were? And A. Biſhop *Uſher*, Biſhop *Hall*, Biſhop *Davenant*, and many more of late? Who hath written more earneſtly and hotly for Epiſcopacy, than Biſhop *Downame* (who wrote the great Latine Book to prove the Pope Antichriſt;) yet who that knew him did ever queſtion his piety or diligence? And if you look to the old Conformable Presbyters, read their Books, and enquire of the Lives of many of them, and then confeſs that they were better men and better Preachers than you deſcribe. Peruſe the Writings of Mr. *Rob. Bolton*, *William Whateley*, *William Fenner*, Dr. *Preſton*, Dr. *Sibbes*, Dr. *Stoughton*, Dr.

Dr. *Gouge*, Mr. *Thomas Gataker*, Mr. *Crook*, and abundance of such others, and enquire how they laboured and lived, and you may hear that they were neither such *Parrots* nor *prophane* ones as you mention.

There may be some proportionable alteration supposed to be now made in the persons of the Conformists, answerable to that which is made in Conformity it self: But surely, if you know *London*, and many Miles near it, and many Parishes in the several Counties, you must confess that now there are many Learned, Pious Conformists, who Preach zealously, and live religiously, and hate Covetousness and Persecution, and long to see the promoting of Piety, Peace, and Concord.

But if you expect a better Vindication of them, I must desire you to consider of two things. 1. That in most Countries and Ages the *worldliest men* (that is, the *worst*) have been the greediest strivers and seekers for Church-Power and Preferments; and he that seeketh most diligently is the likeliest to find: And that ordinarily the Vulgar do dance after the Pipe of him that is uppermost, and will be of the Religion of them that can help or hurt them, be it what it will be. Most will be of the Religion which is owned by Law, or countenanced by the Greatest, be it right or wrong. In the best Countries, the most are too bad: And bad men will have a prospering Religion, and not one that will expose them to Death, Banishment, Imprisonment, Beggary, Contempt, or Silence. Most will be on the upper side.

2. And remember that you your self here confess the scandals of some of your Romish Party, and what carnal prophane ones they are. Had you not confessed it, I would have desired you to read two Books, 1. *Josep. Acosta*, of the wicked slothful Priests in the *Indies*, as

the great hindrance of their Converſion. 2. *Stephanus* his World of Wonders, taken moſt out of the Book of the Queen of *Navarre*, of the horrid Villanies of your Prieſts.

And one thing I cannot diſregard: I marvel not if the Papiſts be moſt bad in *Spain*, *France*, *Italy*, *&c.* or the *Lutherans* in *Denmark*, *Saxony*, or *Sweden*; or the *Calviniſts* in *Holland*; or the Prelatiſts and Conformiſts in *England*; becauſe the *moſt* (who are commonly the *worſt*) will be of the ſtronger ſide. But that *Greeks* ſhould be ungodly in *Turky*, or *Proteſtants* in *France*, or *Papiſts* in *England*, where they are *ſingular*, and under the diſcountenance of the Times, and moſt hold their Religion with ſome *ſelf-denyal*, this ſeemeth to me a more grievous thing. And if it prove true, that even in *England*, where you make the World believe that you have ſuffered grievouſly, your Followers are too often found meer *Formaliſts*, living in Swearing, Drinking, Lying, Uncleanneſs, or ſome of *theſe*, what ſhall we think of ſuch a Religion as this, as in a Land of uprightneſs would teach men to do unjuſtly? I wonder not what ſhould make a Drunkard, Fornicator, or other debaucht Sinner to be a Papiſt in *France*, *Spain*, or *Italy*: But what ſhould make ſuch a one be a Papiſt in *England*, unleſs his Religion favour ſenſuality, *or elſe* he think that it will yet prove the upper ſide, I cannot eaſily conjecture.

But you accuſe the *Prelatick Proteſtant* for *agreeing with the Puritan in expecting Salvation by the extrinſical righteouſneſs of Chriſt without him, not by any interior righteouſneſs in his own Soul.*] *Anſw.* I told you your memory faileth you: Why did you before then deſcribe the Puritan as ſo well qualified within, and deſiring after more? But were you bred among Puritans, and yet talk ſo ignoranly and falſly? This had been more tolerable in

a *Cochleus*, a *Genebrard*, or other transmarine Calumniator, that never knew us here. Read but *Davenant de Just.* and see how you slander the Conformists. And read my fore-named Books, and Mr. *Trumans*, Mr. *Woodbridges*, the Morning Lectures at S. *Giles* of *Justif.* Mr. *Wotton de Reconciliat.* Mr. *Bradshaw de Justif. Præfat. &c.* Mr. *Gataker* in many Books, *Jo. Goodwin* of Justif. *&c.* and see how you slander the Puritans. In a few plain words, Sir, the Protestants do not expect Salvation by their own personal righteousness as coordinate with Christs, but as subordinate to it, nor as a Righteousness so denominated from the same *Reason* as Christs is, but from a lower Reason, and so as of a lower sort. That is, [" We all hold, that " Gods Law to perfect man was perfect, being the Effect " of his perfect Holiness, and required personal perpetual " perfect innocency and obedience in man: And that " man breaking this Law, was according to the Justice of " it lyable to its Penalty, which is temporal, spiritual, and " eternal death, or to be forsaken of that God whom he " forsook, and to be under the sense of his displeasure, or " Justice: We believe that Christ Redeemed us from this " Punishment, by the merit of his perfect Holiness and " Obedience, and the satisfactory sacrificing of himself " on the Cross, where he was in his measure forsaken " of God, as in our stead and for our sins; whose pu- " nishment, as far as was fit for him to undergo, he vo- " luntarily undertook to suffer. We believe that he ne- " ver intended by this Redemption, to take man from " under his subjection to God, or make him an ungovern- " ed lawless Wight; but that by purchase he himself, as " Mediator, became his Lord and King, and Gods chief " Administrator of the Redeemed World: And his Lord- " Redeemer, with the Will and Authority of God his

 " Creator,

" Creator, made him a new Law and Covenant, *freely*
" *giving Right to Impunity* (saving paternal healing Cor-
" rections, and temporal death, and degrees of desertion
" if men neglect Grace) and *Right* to the *Heavenly Glory*,
" as thus merited for us by Christ; and also the Com-
" munion of the Holy Ghost on Earth, to fit us by Holi-
" ness for Heaven, and to conquer our sins; and this to
" all that will by a true effectual Faith, accompanyed with
" Repentance, unfeignedly accept the Gift of God, that
" is, that will truly consent to the Baptismal Covenant,
" taking God for their reconciled God and Father, Jesus
" Christ for their Saviour, and the Holy Ghost for their
" Sanctifier and Comforter, renouncing the Devil, the
" World, and the Flesh, and engaging themselves as in
" a Holy War against them, as the Enemies of the bles-
" sed Trinity, and them. And this Covenant they must
" keep: For as it giveth Right to Life to such Believers, so
" it denounceth certain damnation to Unbelievers and un-
" thankful Neglecters of so great Salvation.

" So that when by [RIGHTEOUSNESSE] we
" mean that which answereth Gods perfect Law, having
" no sinful imperfection, we all profess that we have no
" such Righteousness of our own to trust in, there being
" no man without sin; and all sin by the Law of Inno-
" cency denominating the sinner unrighteous and punish-
" able by death: But instead of such a Righteousness,
" Gods Justice is so far satisfied by the Sacrifice and per-
" fect Righteousness of Christ, as that he freely giveth
" us the foresaid Covenant, and its Free Grace and Bene-
" fits: But because we must be judged by the Redeemer
" according to his Law of Grace, therefore we must in
" our selves personally have the Righteousness which that
" Law or Covenant hath made necessary to our Justifi-
cation

" cation first, and our Salvation afterwards; which is first
" our foresaid Faith or Covenant-Consent, and after (to
" our salvation) our keeping of that Covenant in true
" Obedience and Holiness to the end, and our Victory
" over the three Enemies which we renounced. So that
" briefly, God justifieth as the Donor and the Judge:
" Christ God and Man, as Mediator, justifieth us *meritoriously*, as aforesaid, and by *donation* and *final* sentence;
" our *Jus ad Impunitatem & Gloriam*, our Right to *Impunity* and the *Heavenly Glory*, justifieth us as our *Formal Righteousness* (which is a Relation) against the Accusation that we ought to be shut out of Heaven and damned to Hell. The Covenant of Grace justifieth us, by
" giving us Right to the Love of the Father, the Grace
" of the Son, and the Communion of the Holy Ghost:
" Even as Gods Donative and Condonative Instrument,
" or Act of Grace. Our Personal Faith including Repentance justifieth us, as the matter of our Formal Righte-
" ousness, against that particular Accusation, that we
" are *Impenitent Unbelievers*, and so have no part in
" Christ and his Covenant Gift. And our sincere, though
" imperfect, Holiness added to our Faith, is our material
" Righteousness, against that particular Accusation, that
" we are unholy, and so unqualified for Heaven: So that
" the formal Nature of Righteousness being Relative,
" and the word having various senses according to the
" variety of respects, and all these fore-mentioned ha-
" ving their several parts or offices, to the Being of our
" final perfect Justification, all these may accordingly be
" the Reasons of our expectation of salvation. I forgot
" to adde, that we are so far justified by the *Holy Ghost* also,
" as he is the Author of this Holiness, which is our ne-
" cessary qualification for eternal life. *1 Cor. 6. 10, 11. Tit. 3. 3, 4, 5.*

I have

I have here truly, distinctly, and plainly told you the Protestant and Puritan, that is, the *Christian Doctrine* of Justification.

As to the sense of the word [*Imputing*] see how we do, or do not own it, briefly in Mr. *Bradshaw*'s Preface, or largely in my *Treat. of Justifying Righteousness and Imputation.* And in my *Cathol. Theolog.* I have done you and Christianity the service, to prove by plain Citations, that many of your Learnedest Divines do say herein the same as we, or very little differ from us; and if you will as a Make-bate prove the contrary, you will do it to the Dissenters shame. If you trust not Christ alone, as we do, you will find the want of a Saviour in your necessity, and Purgatory will not serve your turn.

But you tell us, that [*Some of the Prelatick Clergie begin to scoff at the Doctrine of Imputative Justice: One of them lately, in a Sermon before his Majesty, called it, and not improperly, the Mummery of Imputative Justice.*] I will transcribe no more of your Scoff: It's dangerous mocking at such matters: *Imputed Righteousness* is oft mentioned by the Holy Ghost in Scripture. It is not some mens mis-exposition that will justifie your derision. It's no strange thing for men of undigested thoughts on both sides, publickly and privately to revile at each other as erroneous, when if they had but the skill of speaking distinctly, and understanding one another, they would presently profess that they are agreed; or if it be for want of understanding the matter, it's pity but they should be quiet till they understand it. I am of their mind that think it is here safest to keep close to Scripture phrase; for want of which many wrangle about their own ambiguous or ill-made words, that in the matter disagree not.

But,

But, Sir, when you say, *pag.6.* [*An Imputative holy man "is a meer Christmas Mummer*,] And after your jesting "with the Boys and Girls, and the Coblers and Botchers "Regal Attire, and the Daw and her fine Feathers, you "conclude [*such will be the sad Lot of meerly Imputative "Saints, who to themselves and their Brethren seem very "fine in the extrinsical Righteousness of Christ, put on by "their phantastical Faith, whilst God and his Angels un-"der all this conceited assumed Bravery see a lascivious, "wanton, covetous Miser.*] I must crave leave to call upon your Conscience, to judge whether a man that professeth that while he seemed a Puritan he was *but an unholy, lascivious, wanton, and covetous miser*, and since his turning Papist tells the World in Print, that he is now a *most false calumniator*, be a fit person to invite his Relations to such a pitiful change, to save their Souls? While you talkt but of [*Imputative Justice*] some mens ambiguous words gave you an excuse: For some Protestants think that nothing should be called *Justifying Righteousness*, which is not sinless and perfect: But this is but a Controversie about a *Word* or *Name* of Righteousness. But when you here pretend, that they are for *meerly Imputed Holiness*, I must say that I remember not that ever I read a more impudent Slander: And he that will dwell in Gods holy Hill must not receive a false Report, especially in despight of the fullest evidence that man can desire: Are not our Booksellers Shops full of Books for the necessity of personal Holiness? and that none can be saved but Saints? Is it not one of our dislikes of your Way, that Saints must be made rare Canonized Persons, when all Christians hold, that without Holiness none shall see God? When almost all the Sermons that ever I heard Preached by any man of sense in my life profest this, and almost

all

all our Books are on this very ſubject, who would have thought that a man on earth could have been found, that would deny it in the open face of the Sun? Yea, one that ſaith he was a Puritan, and an Univerſity Student? Even when the poor Puritans are ruined, and hunted about, and caſt into Goals, becauſe they dare not give over preaching the *neceſſity of Perſonal Holineſs to ſalvation* (for that is the moſt of all their Sermons that ever I heard) dare you ſtand forth with ſuch an accuſation as this? as if they held no Holineſs neceſſary but Imputative? Why then are we devoted in Baptiſm to the Holy Ghoſt? Yea what are the very Separatiſts more accuſed of, than that they would have none but real Saints in their Communion, too far preſuming to judge the Heart? You ſeem a zealous man, though very ignorant; I pray you ſtudy not to excuſe this, but let us hear that you as openly repent as you have ſinned.

The moſt of your further dealing with the *Prelatick Proteſtant*, is to tell him that his Ritual Principles lead him to turn Papiſt, or elſe he cannot anſwer the Puritan: I take not my ſelf any further fit to interpoſe herein, than to tell you, that in all things truly Indifferent, there is a juſt middle between any miſtaken Scruplers that hold them ſinful, and a Papiſt that maketh them a part of his Chriſtianity or Religion, and will not be of the ſame Religion and Church with thoſe that be not of his mind, nor will willingly ſuffer them to preach or live. I told you that S. *Paul*, and the Churches deſcribed by *Socrates* and *Sozomen* (about *Eaſter*) were of this middle way: They neither thought Liturgies or Ceremonies ſo bad (or unlawful at all,) as ſome on one ſide called Puritans do, nor ſo neceſſary as to make them a Partition-Wall between Churches and Churches, or to forbid Communion,

or

or the Preaching of Christs Gospel, or Christian Peace, to those that differ about them. And I think this middle way is approved by God and Angels, and by many at death, or after long experience, who were against it before in prosperity and passion.

The Instances which you give, are, I. That [*the Prelatick Protestant is very angry with the Puritan, that he will not abstain from Flesh in* Lent, *on* Frydays, Emberdays, *and* Vigils *of Saints----Though practically speaking no body takes less notice of them than himself----And the poor Puritan, because he will not solemnly invite the People to observe, what himself never intends to take the least notice of, must for this be silenced and suspended both from Office and Benefice.*]

Answ. 1. Here you shew what things they be that you turn Papist for: Is not eating Flesh on *Frydays*, *Lent*, or *Vigils*, a worthy matter to make another Religion of, or to prove men to be of differing Churches?

2. I told you before, that the Puritans judgment is as *Paul*'s, that such things should be left indifferent, or at least make no breach among us; by our *judging* or *despising* one another: And that neither the Pope, nor any men on Earth, have Authority to make Universal Laws for them to all the Christian World; and that there is no true Tradition of Apostolical Institution of them: But yet that such Fasts and Feasts as are appointed by true Authority of Prince or Pastors, not against the Laws of God, and such as shall be proved to be instituted by the Apostles, they will observe.

3. But the *poor Puritan* is indeed in hard Circumstances, were there no life after this! Some of them have no Flesh to eat, either on *Frydays*, or any day in the Week, but live thankfully upon Bread and Milk, and some such

things; Fish they would gladly eat, if they could get it. There are now among them such as with many Children have for a long time lived almost only on brown Rye-bread and Water: Many of them take it for a sufficient quantity to eat one temperate Meal a day, though they are in no want; and the Papist that forbeareth Flesh, and eateth better than the Puritan feasteth with, or that fasteth with one Meal a day, which is many Puritans fullest Dyet, doth condemn the poor Puritan as an Heretick, and perhaps burn him at a Stake, or cast him into the Inquisition, for not Fasting. Poor *John Calvin* did eat but one small Meal a day, and the Papist who fast much at the rate as *Calvin* feasted, record him for a gluttonous person. And so did the Pharisees by Christ and his Disciples; *Why do not thy Disciples fast, &c.*

II. Your second Instance is, [*The Prelatick Protestant wonders the Puritan should scruple adorning the Communion Table, with two Wax Tapers, &c.*]

Ans. The former Answer serveth to this: Hear, O ye Puritans, wherein the *Roman* Religion doth surpass yours! Their Altars have lighted *Tapers on*: Do you not deserve to be burnt your selves, if you will not burn Candles on your Altars?

Yea the Pope, who hath power to set up and take down Emperours and Kings, being not only the King of *Rome*, but the Monarch of the whole World, doth appoint these Lights as a Professing *sign* [" *before God and Man,* " *that he is of that Church which in the Primitive Times* " *for fear of Persecution served God by Candle-light in* " *Dens and Caves,*] And is not this to prove the *immutability* of their Church, that vary not in a *Circumstance* from the *Apostolical Institution*? Doth his domineering over Kings and Nations, and the Hosts of Great Princes,

Cardinals, Prelates, Abbots, Clergy, Regulars, Seculars, that obey him, ſhew alſo that he is of that *old Candle-lighted Church*?

But while you ſeem ſtill to plead *Apoſtolical Tradition* for all theſe Great Parts of your Religion, tell the poor Puritan, whether it was by Propheſie, or how elſe, that the Apoſtles delivered to the Church the uſe of theſe *Lighted Tapers*, in commemoration of that which was done in *Dens* long after the death of theſe Apoſtles? I doubt rather, the Pope doth by this practice condemn himſelf, and ſets up theſe Lights to ſhew the World how much he and his Church are changed ſince thoſe fore-mentioned days.

III. You next ſay, [*The Prelatick Proteſtant wonders what hurt the Puritan can ſee in making the ſign of that on the forehead of a new baptized Infant, yet ſmiles at a Papiſt when he makes it on himſelf, or his Victuals, &c.*]

Anſ. None of us are aſhamed of the Croſs of Chriſt, nor loth to profeſs this as openly as you: But if we do it by *Word*, by *Writing*, by *Obeying*, or by *Suffering*, we are of another Religion from you, (it ſeems by you,) unleſs we will do it alſo by *croſſing*: The *Jews* were the *Croſs-makers*: And there are now ſo many *Croſs-makers* in the World, whoſe Trade we like not, that we are not forward to ſet up *their ſign* at *our doors*. But yet there are Puritans and Prelatiſts, that were they among the Deriders of a Crucified Chriſt, where the uſe were not a Formality, or worſe, but convenient to tell the Infidels their mind, that they are *not aſhamed of the Croſs of Chriſt*, would not refuſe ſeaſonably to Croſs themſelves. But the Puritans think, that when it is made [*a ſolemn ſtated ſign of the Duty and Grace of the New Covenant, dedicating thereby the perſon to God, as one hereby obliging himſelf*

ſelf to profeſs the Faith of Chriſt Crucified, and manfully to fight under his Banner againſt the Devil, the World, and the Fleſh to the death, *in hope of the Benefits of his Croſs and Covenant, and ſo is made a Badge or Symbol of our Chriſtianity*,] then it is made a *Sacrament of the Covenant of Grace, added to Chriſts Sacrament of the ſame uſe*; or at leaſt *too like it*, though the *Name* be denyed it: And they think that Chriſt hath given none power to make *ſuch new Sacraments or Symbols of Chriſtianity*; he having done that ſufficiently himſelf. They have a conceit that the King would not be pleaſed with them that either frame a new *Oath of Allegiance* added to his, as the *Badge* of his *Subjects Loyalty*, nor yet that would make a new *Badge* of the *Order of the Knights of the Garter*, without his conſent. At leaſt, the Puritans think that *Baptiſm, and Chriſtianity, and Chriſtian Burial ſhould not be denyed to thoſe Children, whoſe Parents do not offer them to be baptized with this additional Symbol*: And if the poor men be deceived in ſuch thoughts, it is but in fear of ſinning againſt Chriſt, and not that they are more aſhamed of his Croſs than you, or more diſobedient to Authority.

IV. Your next inſtance is, [*The Prelatick Proteſtant wonders that the Puritane can doubt the holy Euchriſt is really and truly the body of Chriſt*, &c.] And you cite Dr. *Coſins Hiſt. Tranſub. p.* 44.

Anſw. 1. The *Prelatick Proteſtant* and the *Puritane* differ not at all about the real preſence of Chriſts body in the Sacrament, as I have ſhewed you elſewhere. What need you more proof than King *Edwards* old Rubrick againſt the Real Preſence in a groſs ſence, lately reſtored to the Liturgie. And as for Dr. *Coſins* words and book, I again tell you, all the Doctors of the Roman Church

are

are never able to answer his full proof that Transubstantiation is a late innovation; and none of the doctrine of the ancient Churches. We challenge you all to give any reasonable answer to that book: And you still Cunningly bawke the main Controversie between us and you, which is not whether *Christs Body be* there, but whether *Bread and Wine be* there. For I have told you, 1. That we who know not how far a Glorified Spiritual Body is extensive and invisible to us, cannot tell you where it is present or absent, no more than of an Angel. 2. But we all hold, as a piece of Plate or Silver Barrs, is really and truly turned into the Kings Coine, so the Bread and Wine is really and truly turned into Christs *Sacramental Body and Blood*; and yet one is *Silver* and the other is *Bread and Wine* still: The change is *true, but Relative* by its Separation to that holy use: as a Common person may be Really Changed into a *King*, or a *Lord*, or a *Judge*, or a *Captain*, or a *Bishop*, or a *Doctor*, and yet be a *man* still. This *real* change we all Confess. But the question is, whether there be *no Bread.*

V. You say [*The Prelatick Protestant wonders* that the *Puritan when he is going out of this world should find difficulty to make a particular Confession of his sins, if any grievous matter lye on his Conscience, and humbly desire the Prelatick Priests absolution, saying &c*].

Answ. I know of no difference between the Prelatist and the Puritan about *Confession* or *Absolution.* Dr. John *Reynolds* a true Puritan, received *Absolution* before he dyed: Meer Puritans believe that it is a duty to Confess our sins to men. 1. In Case of such injury to any as must have a Confession towards the injured persons *Satisfaction* and *forgiveness.* 2. In Case of such difficulty about either the nature of the *sin*, or *Consequent dangers* or *duty*es, as

make

make a particular Guide neceſſary, who cannot reſolve our doubts till he know the Caſe. 3. In Caſe that the Conſcience be ſo burdened with the ſin, as that the ſinner cannot by other means find eaſe, till he have disburdened himſelf by ſuch Confeſſion. 4. In Caſe it be neceſſary to heal any ſcandal given to others; It is a very great duty for drunkards, fornicators, deceivers, and ſuch others to go to their Companions, and lament their ſin, and perſwade them no more to do as they have done: And if required by the Paſtors to take publick ſhame before the Congregation, and acknowledg that the doctrine of Chriſt never countenanced them in any ſuch ſin, that Religion and the Church may not bear the reproach of their delinquency. And to beg the prayers of the Congregation for their pardon, and that the Paſtor by virtue of his office will pronounce it.

But we are not aſhamed to confeſs that neither Puritans nor Prelatiſts think it lawful to make the people believe that they muſt needs tell the Prieſt of all the ſins that they commit, and dutyes that they omit; Nor to uphold pragmatical Prieſts in the trade of knowing all mens thoughts and ſecret actions, even Princes, by which they may betray them. 1. The number of people and of their ſins, is ſo great as render it impoſſible: In this Pariſh it's thought there is above threeſcore thouſand ſouls: How many thouſand ſinful thoughts, or words or deeds a great part of theſe may commit in a year, I leave to your Conjecture: only I muſt tell you that if all men High and Low, that are called Papiſts about us, ſhould but tell the Prieſt of every time they are drunk, and every Fornication they have committed, every prophane Oath they have ſworn, every Lye they have told, (eſpecially againſt the Proteſtants,) and of every filthy and prophane Word

that

that they have ſpoken, and every Oppreſſion of the poor, and every filthy or covetous thought that hath been in their hearts, they had need of a very Traditional Memory to remember them, or great plenty of Ink and Paper to record them, and a whole Dioceſs of Clergy-men in one Pariſh to hear them. How many hundred Prieſts muſt this Pariſh have, if all ſhould thus confeſs all ſins of Commiſſion and Omiſſion? every cold Prayer, and omitted Prayer, Exhortation, Alms, Example, *&c.* eſpecially the great Omiſſions of the Soul, in the defects of the exerciſe of Faith, Hope, Love, and Patience, *&c.*

2. And what good will it do a man, that is himſelf of ſound underſtanding and integrity, to open his Conſcience to an ignorant or unconſcionable man, that will call evil good, and good evil, and will put him upon ſin; as you here do by your Relations; or that dare himſelf ſin as boldly as you here do, when you accuſe Puritans and Prelates as holding *meer Imputed Holineſs.*

3. And how great a temptation and injury may this be to your Prieſts, in ſuch inſtances as *Montaltus* the *Janſeniſt* mentioneth, with which I will not defile my Paper? when, alas! moſt of them are not men fit to bear ſuch temptations: What if twenty thouſand People in one Pariſh ſhould each make this Confeſſion to a Papiſt Prieſt, [*I am afraid I have ſinned in believing the common Report, that you are a very ignorant drunken ſot, and a common whoremaſter, and a proud, covetous, lying man*;] would it not be like to enrage the Prieſt into an enmity againſt his Flock? If all the Fornicators in ſuch a Pariſh ſhould tell ſuch Prieſts of all their filthy thoughts, and words, and their *immodeſt actions*, and *actual Fornications*, how like were it to make ſuch impreſſions on the poor Prieſts Phantaſie, as would pollute him with many filthy imaginations.

VI. You

VI. You adde, [*The Prelatick Proteſtant wonders at the Puritan's niceneſs, that he can by no means be perſwaded to bow at the Name of Jeſus: When Nature teacheth us a Relative Reverence, &c. The ſound of the Name Jeſus is vaniſhed and gone, before the ſuperſtitious worſhipper can make his mimical Congie: whereas the Picture, a far more lively repreſentation of the ſame great Lord, remains.*]

Anſ. 1. The Puritans think it not unlawful to bow when God or Jeſus are named. But, 1. They are loth to ſerve thoſe men, that would turn all ſerious Religion into a dead Image of it. 2. And they like not bowing at the Name Jeſus, and not at the Name [*God*], or [*Chriſt*, or *Immanuel*, or *Jehovah*, or the *Holy Ghoſt*.]

2. As to Images, I will but refer you to Dr. *Stillingfleet*'s laſt Book againſt *Godwin*, which hath fully proved, that you uſe them as truly Idolatrouſly as did the Heathens.

VII. Your next Inſtance is, [The *Conformiſts* rejecting the Popiſh *Girdle*, *Stole*, and *Caſuble*, and yet wondring at the *Puritans* rejecting the *Surplice*.]

Anſ. The former Anſwers ſerve to this: Some *Puritans* would uſe the Surplice, if that would ſerve and ſatisfie. But they ſee, that if they ſay [*A*] firſt, they muſt ſay [*B*] next, and ſo on to the end of your Alphabet. But ſtill you tell us what great things your new Religion doth conſiſt of, and what great cauſe you had to turn from the Puritans to the Papiſts? If you had known no more than Books can tell you, and your Grandfather had not known better than *Baronius* himſelf, what the Apoſtles did and inſtituted, we ſhould never have known that the Religion which is integrated by a *Surplice*, *Girdle*, *Stole*, and *Caſuble*, had been herein Apoſtolical, and not rather a novel thing.

VIII. Your

VIII. Your eighth Instance is about *praying for the dead*: But whatever you say of the Rector of S. *Martins* in *Oxford*, there is no difference between the *Puritans* and the *Prelatick Protestants* in that point: You mistake the matter: It is *another passage*, or *two* or *three* at Burial, which the Puritan sticks at, *viz.* which pronounceth of every individual person in the Kingdom, Atheists, Infidels, Papists, and Impenitent Sinners that we bury, except only the *Excommunicate*, *Unbaptized*, and *Self-murderers*, that [*God of his mercy hath taken to himself the Soul of this our dear Brother, out of the miseries of this sinful life, &c.*]

IX. Your last Instance indeed toucheth the quick of our Controversie with *Rome:* You say [*The Prelatick Protestant wonders at the Puritan's Pride, that he will not submit his judgment in matters of Faith, to the determination of a Council of all the Reverend Bishops of the Land, his Majesty as Supreme Head and Governour presiding,*] yet submit not [*to the determination of a General Council of all the Learned Bishops of the Christian World, his Holiness the Pope as Supreme Pastor presiding, and believe as the Universal Church of Christ believeth: It's fitting, says the Conformist, that for Order sake in Christs Church, there should be in every Nation some Supreme Governours, to whose Directions in matters of Divine Worship, all should submit; else we shall have as many Christian Religions and ways of Worship, as there are Parishes, Families, or Persons. The Puritan replyeth, It seems as rational that Christ should for the same Reasons of conserving union, decency, and order in his Church, appoint one Supreme Pastor over all Christians, dispersed in all the Nations of the World, whom all should obey in the vacancy of General Councils.*]

Ans. This deserveth our wakeful Remarks: I. So your

 sacred

facred Cardinal *Bertrand* (in *Biblioth. Patrum*) faid, that *God had not been wife elfe, if he had not placed one Supreme, as his Vicar over the World.* And fo you can tell what *God hath done*, by your fuperlative Wit which can tell us what he *ought to do.* God doth all wifely: But if he had not made an Univerfal Head of the World under him, he had not done wifely; *ergo*, he hath made fuch an Head, *&c.* This is Hiftorical Logick.

II. But is this Monarch the Head in *Civil* Government, or only in *Eccleſiaſtick*? Why is your *One Church* no more *One* in anfwering this Queftion? Nay why were poor *Barclay*, *Withrington*, and fuch others, whofe Writings *Goldaſtus* hath preferved, fo hardly judged of, for pleading for Kings Supremacy in Civil Government? And if you are of their mind, tell us if you can, why God muft not be judged as unreafonable and unwife, if he have not made *One Univerſal Civil Monarch of all the World*? I undertake, when you will come to a due tryal, to prove, that *Civil Government* is fuch as may as well, and *far better*, be done by *Officers* and *Deputies* than the *Eccleſiaſtical Government* can: And I pray who is the Univerſal Monarch? Or who muft be he? Or how muft he be chofen? I would have our King have no mortal King fet over him, at leaft without a chufing Vote. And fhall they meet in a General Council of Kings to chufe one? By that time the Place and Time be agreed on, and the Kings have all left their Kingdoms, and be come from the *Antipodes*, and the *Terra Auſtralis incognita*, and all other Kingdoms to that Council to chufe a Monarch of the World, they will be too old to return home again. Or fhall they fight it out, till one have Conquered all the reft? Alas, who fhall bear the charge of the Conqueft at the *Antipodes*, and who fhall anfwer for all the Blood?

When

When one cannot get all *Europe* at a cheaper rate, than will be expreſſed by many Kingdoms groans, and the Soil dunged with mens fleſh and blood. I have long ago on this ſubject given (in my *Key for Catholicks*) an Anſwer to *Richlieu*, and to *Carol. Boverius*, who wrote for the Honour of Eccleſiaſtick Monarchy, from the ſimilitude of Civil, to have perverted our late King; as if he would have made him believe, that the World muſt have one mortal Monarch.

Contrarily, If it be *Madneſs and Hoſtility to all Kings and States, for any one man on earth to claim and ſeek to be the Monarch of all the World in Civil Government, it is madneſs and hoſtility to Kings, Paſtors, and People, for any one man to claim and ſeek to be the Monarch of all the World in Eccleſiaſtick Government. But the former is true:* Ergo, *ſo is the latter.* I am ready to make good the Compariſon.

III. But, Sir, if the Pope be S. *Peter's* Succeſſor, is not his *Apoſtolick office* as Univerſal as his *Monarchy* or Ruling office? Surely the *firſt part* of the *Apoſtles office* was to preach and *baptize*, and *make Chriſtians* and *gather Churches*, and the Governing of them was but the ſecond part: And is the Pope the *Apoſtle* of all the world? Then it ſeemeth that he is a betrayer of moſt of the whole earth to the Devil, that neither preacheth to them *per ſe vel per alios*. But S. *Peter's* Charge was not *Vniverſal* but *Indefinite*. And even as to *Government*, why did he never ſo much as ſend his Deputies to govern the Abaſſins for ſo many hundred years? Nay hence it ſeemeth to follow, that all the preaching and Church-order that hath been for ſo many hundred years, either there or in any other Nation, by which millions have been turned to Chriſtianity and edified, without the miſſion or

Commiſſion of the Roman Monarch, ſhould have been left undone, and all was unlawful?

IV. But muſt your *Pope* be obeyed as Supreme but in the *Vacancy of General Councils*? Dare you preach this at *Rome*? 1. How then come the Councils of *Conſtance* and *Baſil* for ſuch Doctrine to be *unapproved or reprobate Councils*? How came Pope *Eugenius* to keep up and continue the ſucceſſion, when ſo great a General Council had depoſed him as Heretical, Simoniacal, and many ways flagitious? 2. And what? Have we a Catholick Church with two Heads? that are *per vices* the Vicars of Chriſt? A *Pope* one year, and a *Council* another? Then ſure they are *two Churches*, ſeeing the *Pars imperans* is the *ſpecifying part*. 3. But the beſt is, it is at the Pope's will, whether ever there ſhall be a General Council more? And he knoweth which ſide his Bread is Buttered on? Nay, they ſay, no Decree is valid without his approbation: And if ever a *John*, or *Eugenius* of them all will approve of his own Depoſition for Hereſie, Simony, Adultery, *&c.* he is not the Man that I took him for. 4. But if the name [*General Council*] be not a Cheat, and taken for a Council very far from being General, as to the *whole Chriſtian World*, let the Pope ſet his heart at reſt, I will undertake to ſecure him from the danger of ſuch a Council, and to prove that ſuch there never *ought* to be, *will be*, or *can be*, unleſs Chriſtianity come much nearer to be rooted out of the Earth, and the Church brought into a narrower room.

V. But you have a reflecting Compariſon between the *Kings preſiding* and the *Popes*, and between a *National Council* and the *Biſhops of the whole Chriſtian World*. To begin at the later part. Alas poor *ignorant Man*, if you believe this your ſelf? And alas *unfaithful Man*, if

if you believe it not and yet dare say it? Do you yet know no difference between the *orbis Romanus*, and the *orbis universalis*? Or will you with *William Johnson*, alias *Terret*, prove your Councils to be Universal, because such places as *Thracia* had Bishops there, as if *Thracia* had been without the Empire? or because such a name as *Johannes Persidis* is found at *Nice*? Read all the subscribed names, and return to a sounder mind! *Theodoret* knew what he said, when he gave the reason why *James* Bishop of *Nisibis* in *Persia*, or near it, was at the Council of *Nice*, *Because* Nisibis *was then under the* Roman *Emperour*.

Do you not know that most of the Christian World (two to one) are not of the Pope's Subjects; and are *All the Bishops of the Christian World* then on your side? And do you not know that when *Constantine* presided at *Nice*, his Dominion was full as large as the Bishop of *Rome*'s was, and a little larger.

VI. But because you shall find us reasonable, we will tell you, that we consent to General Councils where the Pope consenteth not? We consent to what the great Councils at *Calcedon* and *Constantinople*, before mentioned, say of the *Humane Institution of his Primacy*, and the *Reason* and *Mutability* of it; and so doth not the Pope? We consent to the Councils at *Constance*, *Basil*, *Pisa*, that the Pope may be deposed as a Heretick, and worse; but the Pope doth not: Is it not he then that dissenteth from *all the Bishops of the World*?

VII. And for the Kings presiding we wholly own it: He is the Governour of *Clergy-men*, as well as of Physicians; and he is to see that they abuse not their Function

to

to the common hurt. The difference is here, 1. Our King Governeth but his own Dominions: But your Pope would Govern all the World. 2. Our King hath an undoubted Title: Your Pope is an Usurper. 3. And as to your name [*Head*] he hath given the World full satisfaction, that he did never claim to be a *Priest-Head* or *Governour*, a *Constitutive* Head of a *properly called Church*, nor to have the power of *Word*, *Sacraments*, and *Keys*, so as to administer them; but to be a Civil *Head* and Governour of Priests, and the Churches in his Dominions; as he is of Physicians, *&c.*

VIII. And you mistake the Puritans, if you think they are not for this Government: Why else take they the Oath of Supremacy? Yea, and if you think that they are not for as much Unity and Concord of all the Churches in a Kingdom, as can be had without a greater hurt, than the lesser particularities of their concord will do good: And they are not against National Synods for such Concord: And they hold the King to be the *Regular Head or Governour*, *or* Principium *of that Concord*: But not *principium essentiale ipsius Ecclesiæ*: And therefore the Puritans differ from judicious *Ric. Hooker*, who saith, [*If the King be the Head of the Church, he must needs be a Christian:*] For we hold that an *Infidel King* may be so the Head, that is, the *Rightful Governour* of the Christians and Churches in his Dominion; or else how should they be obliged to obey him?

IX. And you are mistaken, if you think that the Puritans and the Prelatists differ about submitting our Faith to the judgment of the Church: We subscribe the same Articles, which say that General Councils may erre, and have erred, even about matters of Faith.

X. But I must tell you, that the Puritans, who are accused

cuſed of *diſorder* and *confuſion*, do many of them loath *diſorder* and *confuſion*, even in *words* and *doctrine*. And they diſtinguiſh here between the *Churches keeping* and *teaching* the Chriſtian Faith, and the *Churches judging in matters of Faith*. The firſt they are wholly for: We muſt receive our Faith from our Teachers, and *oportet diſcentem fide humana credere*. But if by *Judging* you mean ſtrictly a *Deciſive judgment*, in which we muſt reſt, which way ſoever the ſentence paſs, as if the Church might not only teach us the truth of our Religion, but judge *in partem utramlibet*, whether it be true or not, the Puritans own no ſuch power in the Church, nor will ſo ſubmit their Faith to the judgment of it. They believe that Paſtors in Councils have power to judge that there is a God, Almighty, *&c.* a Chriſt, a Holy Ghoſt, that Chriſt dyed, roſe, *&c.* that the Scripture is true, that there is an abſolute neceſſity of Holineſs, that there is a Reſurrection and Life everlaſting, that Gods Commandments muſt be kept, and ſin not committed, *&c.* But that no Council hath power to judge that there is no God, no Chriſt, or the contrary to any one of theſe, or any other revealed Truth of God.

XI. And I muſt not let paſs your Schiſmatical inference, that [*elſe there ſhould be as many Religions and ways of worſhip as Pariſhes or perſons*] if ſome ſupreme Governour determined not in matters of worſhip: For 1. It was not ſo, when no Supreme Governour determined, on earth: 2. But either you mean the *Subſtantials* of Gods Worſhip or the *Circumſtantials*: In the firſt as *faith* is not to be got by force, ſo neither is *Godlineſs*, but yet Governours ſhould here do their beſt: But as to the other we abhor the Conceit, that there are as *many Religions*, as there is difference about *veſtures*, *geſtures*, *days and meats*:

But

But perhaps you take the word *Religion* in the Romane ſenſe, as you confine it to thoſe that you call [*the Religious*] (as if you took the people of your Church to be irreligious:) And ſo *you* have indeed *too many Religious*, however they come to make one Church: The Religion of the *Carthuſians* is one, and of the *Benedictines* another, and of the *Franciſcans* another; I cannot name them all: One eateth Herbs and Fiſh, and another eateth Fleſh ſeldom, another often; one weareth one habit, and another weareth another; one Religion hath one Rule of Life, and another hath another. But with us there is but *one Religion* (which is the *Chriſtian*) though one man wear cloth and another ſtuffe, one white and another black, one eat Fleſh and another Fiſh, and another can ſeldom get either; though one wear his Hair long and another ſhort, though one be old and another be young, yet we are all of one Religion: Yea, though one preach and pray in Engliſh, another in Welch, another in French, and another in Dutch, yet we take not theſe to be ſo many Religions: No nor though one think *Free praying* fitter for Miniſters than an *impoſed Form*, and another think an *impoſed Form* only fit, and a third think as the meer Puritan, that *both* having their Conveniences and Inconveniences, there ſhould be ſeaſons *for both*.

And I pray you here tell me two things if you can. 1. Whether the great *difference of Liturgies* (which are the very *words* and *Order* of the *Churches Worſhip*) be not liker a *difference of Religions*, than the *colour* of our *cloaths*, or the *meat* we *eat*, or the *lighting* of a *Candle*, *&c.* And yet do I need to tell you how many Liturgies are recorded in the *Bibliotheca Patrum*? Yea, that it was ſix hundred years and more before the Churches in *one Empire* uſed all one and the ſame Liturgy? and for ſome hundred

hundred years, that every Church uſed what the Biſhop pleaſed? Yea, that the firſt reſtraint of *free-praying* that we find was, by a Council ordaining that the Presbyter ſhould firſt ſhew his Prayer to the Fathers that they might be ſure it was ſound? And had *Baſil* and *Chryſoſtome*, and all others that varyed, as divers *Religions* as *Liturgies*?

2. Whether all the *doctrinal* Controverſies among your ſelves, as between all your School *Doctors* about Predeſtination, Grace, and free will, about Perſeverance, about the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin *Mary*, about the Power of the Pope over all Kings in Temporals, and about the killing of excommunicate Kings, and the abſolving their Subjects, and whether after excommunication they *are Kings* or *no*, (of which *Hen. Fowlis* hath cited great ſtore on one ſide,) and all the Moral Controverſies about loving God, about Perjuries, Vows, Murder, Fornication, Lying, Stealing, Drunkenneſs, Gluttony, (of which you may ſee great ſtore in *Montaltus*'s Letters, The Myſtery of Jeſuitiſme, and Mr. *Clarkſons* late Book called *The Practical Divinity of the Church of Rome:*) I ſay, is not Religion as much concerned about all theſe differences, and all the reſt among you which make many Horſe-loads, yea I think Cart-loads of Volumes, as it is in the colour of the Preachers Cloaths, or the Meat he eateth? And are not Proteſtants (that is, *meer Chriſtians* diſowning Popery) as juſtifiable in their Unity and Charity, for taking Men to be of the ſame Religion, who uſe not the ſame Garments, Geſtures, and Ceremonies, and that bear with differences herein, as your Church that beareth with all theſe loads of different Doctrines in your moſt Learned Famous Doctors (and not in the weaker Prieſts alone) even whether excom-

 municate

municate Kings may be killed or no; and whether the Pope hath Power to put down and set up Emperours and Kings? If you say that your *One Religion* and *One Church* hath no such difference, it must be by saying that you all agree to *Gregory* the seventh in *Concil. Rom. & Innoc.* 3. in *Concil. Lateran.* on the worser side, and all own the Doctors cited by *H. Fowlis* aforesaid: But indeed I must speak better of you, even that some are of a better mind, whom *Goldastus* hath gathered and preserved, and divers of the Learned Men of *France*, and some in *Spain*. But we think the difference even between the Prelatists, Presbyterians, Independants, yea and the moderate Anabaptists, to be far less than these which your unanimous agreeing Church, doth constantly bear with, without Silencing, Imprisoning, Ejecting, or Condemning, or so much as *disowning* the judgments of the worser side.

He that readeth *Parsons* on one side, and *Watson's Quodlibets* on the other; *Barclay* and *Witherington* on one side, and *Zuarez* and the far greater prevalent Party on the other, will either wonder at the *strength of your Unity* which no doctrinal differences even about the Blood of Kings can at all dissolve; or else he may wonder at the laxe and sandie temperament of such Protestants as cannot bear with a Man that readeth not in their Book, and singeth not in their Tune; and is still crying out against others as Sectaries, because they *have piped to them and they have not danced*; and such as no Man can live quietly within reach of, unless they swallow every Morsel which they cut for them, having Throats neither wider, or at least no narrower than theirs. As if King *Henry* the eighth's days were the measure of true Discipline, when one Man was burnt for being too far from Popery, and another hanged, or beheaded, for being

ing Popish, and it was hard to know the middle Region, and harder to know how long it would be calm? till strangers cryed, *Deus bone, quomodo hic vivunt Gentes.* But as none are more cruel in Wars than Cowards, (nor in Robberies than Women,) nor any more gentle and pitiful than valiant experienced Souldiers; so few are so insolent and bloody obtruders of their Dictates and Wills upon the World, as those that being least able to prove them good, have nothing but Inquisitions and Prisons, Silencings and Banishings, Fire and Faggot, effectually to make them good.

But if St. *James* be in the right, who saith, that *Pure Religion and undefiled is this, to visit the Fatherless and Widows in their adversity, and to keep our selves unspotted of the world*, then certainly the *Jesuits Morals*, and the *Mystery of Jesuitism*, and *Clarkson*'s *Roman Practical Divinity*, and *Fowlis*'s Treasons of the Papists, contain more of the concerns of Religion, than preaching in a consecrated or unconsecrated place, and than eating Flesh, Fish, or neither, in *Lent* or on *Fridays*, doth. O the strange difference between your Unity and Concord, and the Protestants! How fast is yours? How loose is ours?

And it is to be considered we pretend not to so much perfection in this world, as ever to expect that all Men should be just of the same Size and Complexion, or speak the same Language, or have all the same Opinions, Thoughts, or Words: If we can keep the *Unity of the Spirit in the Bond of Peace*, in the seven Points named by the Apostle, *Eph.* 4. 3, 4, 5, 6. so far as we have attained do walk by the same Rule (of Love and Peace) and mind the same things, till God reveal more to such as differ, (*Phil.* 3.) we shall be glad of such a measure

of Union: For we believe it impoſſible to be perfect in Concord, while moſt, yea all are ſo wofully imperfect in Knowledge, Faith, Love and Obedience. We wait for perfection of all in Heaven; and we find that few things in the World ever did ſo much againſt Unity, as pretending to more than is to be hoped for, and laying in on ſo high terms, and ſo many as we know will never be received. Therefore our Mutual Love and forbearance with different Forms and Circumſtances, is agreeable to the Principles of our Religion.

But for you that pretend to *Unity, Concord, and Infallible Judgement*, to tolerate Cart-loads of Doctrinal Controverſies, divers Expoſitions of many hundred Texts of Scripture, divers readings of the Text it ſelf, contrary Doctrines about God's Grace, about all the Ten Commandments, about the Eſtates and Lives of Kings, and never ſo much as to condemn either ſide nor ſilence the Preachers, never impriſon them, or baniſh them five miles from Cities and Corporations, never put them to any diſgrace, but ſtill honour them as renowned Doctors, as if the Lives of Kings, and the reſt of theſe things were leſs than a Form of Prayer, or a Ceremony, yea when your Inquiſition torment poor Proteſtants for ſmaller matters, (as reading the Bible, or a Proteſtant Book;) methinks all this ſheweth that Chriſtian Concord is founded on better Principles than yours, and that yours is but the Bond of your Clergy intereſt.

CHAP.

CHAP. IV.

His own false Description of Papists.

YOUR next work being to give your Relations, first the *false* and then the *true* description of a *Papist*, it's most deceitful work that you make in both.

I. In the false description you do quite pass over the great *Constitutive* Causes of Popery, in which it is that it differs from *Apostolical Christianity:* And you name a few of the superstructures or remoter differences, and cite not one Protestant that speaketh those words, but only the present *Arch-bishop of York*, and as you say, the *vulgar* conceit: And you are ordinarily careful, in every Paragraph, to put in *some one word*, by the disowning of which you may disown the sentence.

But, 1. Is it not a meer deceiving trick to word your own Accusations so in the Protestants name, as you know you can easilyest plead, *Not Guilty*? May not one alter some *one word* in every Verse of any Chapter in the Bible, and then protest, that *not one of all those Verses is in the Bible*? So if the Printer have some *Errata* in each Leaf of your Book, may you not protest that not one Leaf of it is yours?

2. And is it not deceitfully done to appeal to the *Vulgar* as the Accusers, that thus charge you, when you know how vain it is to expect, that, (how sound soever their judgments be) the Vulgar should state any Controversies so exactly, as not to miss it in a *word* or *more*; when they hit the sense? And you knew how hard it is to disprove you: For who shall judge what is the opinion of

of the Vulgar? If I ſhould ſay that *few* or *none* of my acquaintance do charge you to ſpeak thoſe very words, you may ſay that *you know ſome that do*, and I cannot confute you.

3. And have you not the Differences between you and us voluminouſly ſtated and handled long ago, by many whoſe Books have been received by the Churches, and Licenſed by Authority, when the *Vulgar ſtating* of them was never Licenſed nor owned? Why did you not gather out of *Jewel*, *Uſher's Anſwer* to the *Jeſuites Challenge*, Dr. *Challoner*, *Chillingworth*, Dr. *Field*, Dr. *Crakenthorp*, Dr. *Reignolds*, Dr. *John White*, Biſhop *Morton*, Dr. *Ames*, *Sadeel*, *Chamier*, *Whitakers*, or ſuch others, what the things are that Proteſtants charge you with? And anſwer what is there charged on you?

I my ſelf have enumerated many of the things which we take for Popery, and not to be defended, in my *Key for Catholicks*, and in my *Safe Religion*, and in One *Sheet againſt Popery*, almoſt twenty years ago; and ſince then in my [*Full and eaſie ſatisfaction which is the true Religion*,] and in my [*Certainty of Chriſtianity without Popery.*] And you have given no anſwer to any one of them that I ever heard of: But you can better diſpute, it ſeems, with your *Relations*, and with the *Women* and *Country-Labourers*, or *Tradeſmen*, that never uſe to ſpeak in that ſtrictneſs of words as ſhall prevent the Cavils of a ſtudied Sophiſter.

4. As for the A. B. of *York*, I am almoſt a Stranger to him, and more to his Book, which I never ſaw: But two things I can ſay, 1. That we are no more obliged to juſtifie his words, than you to juſtifie the words of any one of your Doctors. 2. That no man is ſo fit to anſwer for him as he is for himſelf: Becauſe no man knoweth ſo well

well in what ſenſe he took the word [*Papiſt.*] I ſuppoſe you know that *Grotius*, who perſwadeth us all to an *obedient Union with your Church, under the Popes Government according to the Canons, owning the Decrees of all the Councils, even that of* Trent, yet for all this doth ſpeak againſt *Papiſts:* But he tells you that by *Papiſts* he meaneth *thoſe Flatterers of the Pope, who approve of all that he ſaith or doth.* And that it was not the *Government* or *Doctrine* of that Church that was to have been *reformed*, but the *Opinions* of ſome *Schoolmen*, and the *exceſſes*, and *ill lives* of *many* of the *Clergie*. Now could not *Grotius* eaſily have produced ſuch *Papiſts* as theſe, as having ſaid as groſs things as you recite?

And how far Biſhop *Bromhall*, and the Doctor that lately publiſhed him, own *Grotius*, I will not tell you, but refer you to their own words: To which many more might eaſily be added. Now ſuppoſe that Dr. *Heylin*, or A. Biſhop *Bromhall*, or his Prefacer ſhould ſay, that by [*Papiſts*] they mean ſuch as *Grotius* did, do you think that they could not prove as groſs words, as any cited by you, in ſome ſuch Flatterers of the Pope? And you know, I ſuppoſe, that ſome of late would not have the *Church of Rome* called *Papiſts*, or at leaſt ſo charged, but only the *Court of Rome*.

But let us take notice of ſome of the Particulars.

I. Your firſt Article is, That *Papiſts are ſaid to Worſhip Stocks and Stones, Medals, and Pictures of Jeſus Chriſt as Gods, and pray to them, and put their whole confidence in them, as the ancient Heathens did in their dumb Idols of* Jupiter, Mars, *&c.*

Anſ. 1. Your Doctors are oft charged with maintaining that the Image of *Chriſt* and the *Croſs* muſt be *worſhipped with latria*, which is the Worſhip called Divine: And

And instead of this you put in the word [*as Gods.*] It is not [*as reputing these Images to be really Gods,*] but [*worshipping them as God only should be worshipped,*] contrary to the second Commandment, which forbiddeth such *Bodily actions* as were symbolical of Idol-Worship, though the *Mind* were kept never so free from accounting God to be like Idols, or Idols to be Gods.

2. Who chargeth you of putting your *Whole trust in Images*? Is not *part of it* too much?

3. How prove you that the Heathens ordinarily did so? Or that they took *Jupiter, &c.* to be nothing but *the Image*, and not a *Cœlestial Power*?

4. But instead of saying any more on this point, I again tell you, that Dr. *Stillingfleet* hath in his new Defence against *T. G.* so fully proved that the generality of the Heathen Nations did worship one Universal Supreme God, and worshipped their inferior Gods much like as you do Angels, and worshipped their Images, not as being Gods themselves, but with such a Relation to the Deity, as you do your Images; and that your Image Worship is such as the ancient Fathers condemned in the Heathens; that none of you will ever be able solidly to confute him, or defend your Idols any more: So dear do you pay for *T. G.* his temporary triumph.

II. Your second feigned Charge is, [*That the Pope can give men leave to commit any sin for money---or so pardon any sin after, as you shall not be in the least danger of any punishment for it temporal, or eternal, in Purgatory, or in Hell.*]

Ans. I will take your part in this, and prove that the Squib-maker, who drew up this Charge, doth do you wrong. What a Sot was he to think that any Pope would ever be sick, or sore, or dye, if he could forgive

all

all temporal punishment? Unless the unhappy man can forgive all others, and not himself? At least he would preserve some of his Friends in health and immortality on Earth? And the Whores, that *Baronius* himself saith made Popes at their pleasure, would have found some Popes so grateful as to have saved them from dying, if not from bringing forth in pain. And truly I should hope that at least the Pope that by a Council was condemned for an Infidel, and believing not any life to come in Heaven or Hell, would have been so tender-hearted as to forgive all the world the punishment in Hell. And it was a great mistake in these Slanderers of you, to except no sin: As if the Popes could forgive them that would diminish their Kingdoms, or restrain their Domination; much less that would depose them. Could Pope *Eugenius* ever forgive the Universal Church, as it's called, that is, the great General Council which in vain condemned and deposed him? When he can scarce forgive a poor Protestant the Rack and Fire, for reading the Bible or serving God out of the *Roman* way.

And doubtless he is wronged by this Charge, that he can nullifie all *pain, death, Purgatory, and Hell*; for I think you will say, that *quoad potentiam ordinatam* Christ cannot do it, or at least he will not. And were this believed by all the World, no wonder if they willingly obeyed him, and called him, *Our Lord God the Pope*. For he could conquer any Kingdom, by saving all his Souldiers from hurt and death.

It is enough that he can forgive some *part* or *time* of Purgatory Torments, and that (as great Doctors say) he can (and lesser Priests than he) forgive the pains of Hell to a sinner that hath no true *contrition* for sin (that is, repenteth not out of any Love to God or Goodness)

but only *Attrition* and the *Sacrament of Penance and Absolution*, (that is, repenteth only for fear of Hell, and would sin still if he durst.)

And though you may hope that there are no Copies of the old Pardons yet to be seen, or any of *Tecelius* Merchandise now extant, yet the sure History of them is common, and if you deny it, it will be proved to your shame. What a multitude of Writers have better cited your practice and confuted it?

But yet I remember (to do you right) that even *Hildebrand* himself (*Greg.* 7.) in a *Roman* Council saith, that [*neither the Sacrament of Baptism, nor Penance is of any force to pardon any impenitent Hypocrite,*] which is well said; and as for true *Penitent Believers*, we verily believe that they are pardoned *ipso jure* by the Gospel, as to destructive or hellish Punishment; and that every true Minister of Christ may validly deliver this pardon ministerially, by true absolution, in the Sacrament, and without it. But in what *measure* God himself will remit *temporal Chastisements*, few men can know till the event tell it them: And neither Pope nor Priest can forgive without him; nor know what God will remit, any more than another man may know, that is, by Gods Word, and by the event.

And again, I say if it were in the Popes power (however you may absolve him from Bribery or the Love of Money) that there would be more difference in point of bodily suffering, between his Subjects or Favourites and other men, than was ever yet perceived. It's policy therefore to confine the business to *Purgatory*, that no witness may be able to disprove it.

You add to the Charge, [*That of all Christ's Merits the Pope is the Supreme Lord, to dispose of them to the*

living

living and the dead, as he by his unerring Spirit thinks fitting.]

Answ. Here the Charger wrongs you too: For seeing all mens Lives and Mercies are the Fruits of Christs *Merits*, if this were true, the Pope could kill all his Enemies at his pleasure, and when he hath killed them could cast them into Hell, or keep them out of Heaven: And then no one in his wits would be against him, or displease him. It's enough to be able to do as aforesaid.

III. Your next is [*the Papist honours the Virgin* Mary *much more than he does her divine Son, or God the Father: for one Prayer he says to God, he says ten to the Virgin.*]

Answ. This is injurious too, whoever made it: The Pagans honour not their Inferiour Gods, so much as the Supreme! And for the *number* of Prayers, it's not like that all Papists use the same, or by the same Beads: But whether you give *inordinate honour* to the Virgin *Mary*, and put not up a very large proportion of your Prayers to her; if Dr. *Stillingfleet*, and abundance before him, may not be trusted in their Citations, I hope your own Prayer-books may be believed. It's bad enough to make her like *Juno*, though you should not equal her with *Jove*. Angels have refused smaller honour.

IV. You add [*His Prayers are a company of Latine words, he neither understands, or cares to understand them, which if he do but patter over in such a number, though his heart and mind be wholly taken up with worldly thoughts and desires, he thinks*, &c.]

Answ. At the first line one would have thought you had grown past blushing, and had *denyed* your *Latine Prayers*, not understood; but you never want *one word* to help you out in renouncing the whole Sentence: You make me think of that sorry Religion which teacheth

men, that if *one Article in a Vow*, among many, be unlawful, they may renounce all Obligation to any thing else that there is Vowed; and so a Knave may be disobliged to all Vows and Covenants, if he will but drop in any thing that is unlawful. Do not your unlearned Multitude join in your *Latine Prayers*? Do Mass-books, and your daily Masses, all deceive our Eyes and Ears? No, that's not it; what then! must all be *desirous* to understand it, if they cannot? I rather think the Calumny is, that [*his mind and heart may be wholly taken up with worldly desires*?] But who was it that put in that into the Charge? was it not your self? We know that you say, *There should be some General kind of Devotion and good Desire, though he know not what is said*; and *a General Belief*, called *Implicite*, which is *no Belief of any of the Particulars*, and a *General Implicite Desire*, which is *no Desire of any express Particular*, being *a Faith* that is *no Faith*, and *a Prayer* which is *no Prayer*, would make a Religion which is no Religion, if you had no better.

V. The next is [*If he do but believe as his Church-men believe, though he be wholly ignorant of their Belief, his Soul is safe enough.*]

Answ. What is a Man but his Wit? The Word (*wholly*) craftily put in by your self, enableth you also to renounce this Charge: For we all confess that your Doctors commonly hold, that this one Article must be believed, [*That the Church is to be believed and obeyed*,] and that's one Particular. But I pray tell us if you can: 1. Dare your Church say that every word revealed must be believed Explicitely of necessity to Salvation? No: 2. And have they in any General Council determined what those Particular Articles are that are so necessary, (since you departed from the sufficiency of the Creed?)

Or

Or do not your Doctors, without any Decree of the Church, use to debate it as a free opinion? 3. And do they not differ among themselves, as all in pieces about the Point? And do not your chief Learned School-men cited at large by *Fr. a Sancta Clara* on our Articles hold that the Particular Belief of Christ himself, or the supernatural Articles of the Creed are not of necessity? And I know not of any one thing that you are agreed to be necessary, besides the Belief that the *Church*, (that is, the *Pope and his Council*) *are Infallible*, or to be believed and obeyed; and it is a Learned School Doctor and Jesuite *Fran. Albertinus Corol. p.* 250. that justifieth a Countryman that should believe a falshood if twenty Bishops tell it him, and that the Command of Faith doth oblige to believe falshood, it being *not per se, but per accidens, &c.* And I think the old man is now among you at *London*, (*Fr. a Sancta Clara,*) who having cited abundance of Doctors against the necessity of believing in Christ or any Supernatural Point, or in some cases knowing the Law of Nature and the Decalogue, saith *p.* 20. [*To speak my sence freely, I think that the Common People committing themselves to the instruction of the Pastors, trusting their knowledge and goodness, if they be deceived, it shall be accounted invincible ignorance, or probable at least:* So Herera; *which excuseth from fault: Yea, some Doctors give so much to the Instruction of Doctors on whom the care of the Flock lyeth, that if they teach* hic & nunc *that God would be hated, that a rude Parishioner is bound to believe them.* See abundance more in him cited, *Deus, Nat. Grat. Probl.* 15, *and* 16. And that you may know that this opinion is not rare, he addeth, *p.* 123. [*It seemeth to be the common opinion of the Schools and Doctors at this day, that the Laity erring with their Teachers,*

chers, or Paſtors, are altogether excuſed from all fault: Yea, by erring thus many wayes materially they merit for the Act of Chriſtian Obedience which they owe their Teachers, as Valentia *ſaith* To. 3. Diſp. 1. q. 2. p. 5. *and others with* Angles, Vaſquez, *&c.*]

And if this be true, what Prince, Lord, or any other Lay-man, that would be out of all danger of Sin and Hell, would not be a Papiſt, and be ſure to chuſe a Prieſt that is ignorant enough to take Perjury, Drunkenneſs, Gluttony, Adultery, Fornication, Perſecution, Opreſſion for no Sin, and then he may be ſure that it's none to him, but he meriteth by obeying him that will perſwade him to it?

And what if theſe bid Subjects kill their Kings, would it not be ſinleſs and meritorious by this Rule?

But you'll ſay, Theſe be but the words of Writers, and Books may be miſunderſtood, when they ſay that this is the common Opinion of the Doctors. And perhaps if I talk with you, or another, you will proteſt that this is none of your belief. But how ſhall I know that *W. H.* or his Neighbour, or Grandfather, know better what is the Faith or Religion of the Papiſts than the old Queens Confeſſor, and all thoſe famous Doctors, whom he citeth, and all that I my ſelf have read?

And remember your Undertaking, cited in my Title Page.

Is it not the moſt common Opinion of your Doctors, that all men are bound to know and believe according to their opportunities, and probable inſtructions? But what is commonly neceſſary your Learned Church-men cannot tell us, no not the Pope or Councils? And who can tell what other mens capacities and opportunities have been? and ſo whether he be a Believer indeed, or not? or bound to be ſo?

VI. Your

VI. Your next part is, [*He makes Gods of -- ſinful men : -- He maketh leſs ſcruple of violating Gods Laws, than he doth any Ordinance of the Pope, or any Law of his Church.*]

Anſ. That one word [*any*] is either the falſhood of your Accuſer, or the *craft* of the Clark that drew up the Inditement: And I think it ſhould not be drawn up of theſe Laws compared *formaliter*, but *materialiter:* For I cannot think you ſo unreaſonable, as to think that the Pope is above God; but that when you caſt away God's Laws to keep the Pope's, it is becauſe you think that the Pope hath power to change and abrogate God's Laws, or diſpenſe with them; or that you are bound to believe that it is none of Gods Law, if the Pope ſay it's none: For Inſtance, 1. I know that you caſt away Chriſt's Law for receiving his Body and Blood, the Cup as well as the Bread in the Sacrament: But *why* you do ſo, I am no Judge.

2. I know that you break the Second Commandment, and uſually leave it out of the Decalogue too: But why you do it, I am no Judge.

3. I know that the Pope and his approved General Council at *Laterane* make a Law againſt Gods Law for obedience to the higher powers, and this Papiſts profeſs to receive as part of their Religion: But on what reaſons you do it, I leave to you.

You Inſtance [*If he commit Fornication it is but a Venial Sin*] Do You hold that any of your approved Councils have defined it to be a Mortal Sin? If ſo, I hope you will take thoſe for Heretical that think it is not always ſo: I refer you to Mr. *Clarkſons Practical Divinity* aforeſaid, and the Jeſuites Morals. But doubtleſs all of you have not the ſame Judgment either of Fornication or Murder, (as is there proved;) for you are not bound

to

to be so far agreed, in such little things: But your craft put in the *saving word* next, [*and sprinkling himself with a little Holy Water he is as free from all spot as a new Baptized Infant.*]

Answ. They say, *No Man wrongeth himself:* You may lay a false Charge against your self that you may the easier deny it; There must be somewhat more than *Holy water*, else what need of *Attrition* and Confession, and Penance, if it please the Priest, or Commutation of Penance? what need the Crusado's to have killed so many thousands of the *Waldenses* and *Albigenses* to procure the pardon of their sins (O dreadful way to pardon!) What room for Pilgrimages, satisfactions, or for Purgatory, or for Masses to be said for the Souls in Purgatory, or for praying to the Virgin *Mary*, and abundance such, if *Holy water alone* would do all the Business? Was not he much overseen, or did grosly prevaricate, that drew up this Charge? Might I but chuse my Adversaries Advocate, and agree with him to say nothing but what I can disprove, I would certainly have the better, and be justified.

VII. The next part is, [*And as for his obedience to Magistrates, if they be not of his Religion, he owes them no allegiance: And if he have by Oath obliged himself, he has a holy Father can dispense with him for that, or any other Oath, for a piece of Money: If his Prince persecute him for his Religion, let him but have so much desperate courage as to sacrifice his own life to stab or poyson his said Persecutor, he shall at* Rome *be canonized for a Saint: Nor can private Persons expect any fidelity from him, when he is thus traiterously rebellious against his Liege Lord and Soveraign,* &c.]

Ans. Now I perceive you are over bold, and do too hardly

hardly bluſh, when you have the face to bring in ſuch an inſtance, and by the inſerting of a word or two of your own, to dare to waſh off from your Religion the blot of Perfidiouſneſs and Rebellion, when it is part of the Decrees of your approved General Council. The Prevaricator wrongeth you, 1. By making [*not of his Religion*] to be all that's neceſſary to free you from allegiance. 2. By putting in [*or any other Oath for a piece of Money:*] I have not yet found that the Pope undertaketh to diſpenſe with a man that will ſwear to *believe the Roman Church*, or the reſt in Pope *Pius* his *Trent* Oath, nor yet with the Vow of Baptiſm, if ſeconded by an Oath. 3. By ſaying only [*If his Prince perſecute him*;] for the Doctors ſay that he muſt be firſt *excommunicate*, or a Heretick at leaſt, and ſome ſay he muſt have the Pope's Order before he may kill a King; and the Council only ſpeaketh of *Depoſing*, and not of killing. 4. And the Prevaricator too raſhly promiſed [*Canonizing*:] He that murdered one of the *French* Kings, was but *praiſed* in an Oration by the Pope, (proved by many) but not Canonized: *Garnet* was not every one.

But becauſe I ſee you grow ſo bold, (and alſo in what follows return to what you had ſaid before) I will, inſtead of following you farther, tell you what ſuch as I mean by a *Papiſt*, and what ſome other men mean by him.

CHAP. V.

The true History of the Papacy, its original and growth.

THough I reserve the opening of the ambiguities of the word *Papist* till near the end, I shall so far anticipate that, as to tell you here also, that the word [PAPIST] is equivocal: I. In the sense of *Grotius*, and all our Reverend Country-men that are of his judgment, [" *Papists are those that without any difference do ap-* " *prove of all the sayings and doings of Popes, for honour or* " *lucre sake as is usual,*] Discus. p. 15.

If of all, then of all the Adulteries, Murders, Simonie, Heresie, Infidelity charged on some of them by their own Writers and by Councils. I am sorry if this be [*usual*] I hope yet that there are few of these Papists in the World, and that few Popes themselves will deny that they are sinners.

But he elsewhere desireth the Reformation, 1. Of some bold disputes of the School-men; 2. And the ill lives of the Clergie; 3. And some Customs which have neither Councils, nor Tradition.

II. Some who are for the Supremacy of *General Councils* above the Pope, do call those *Papists* that are for the *Pope's Supremacy above such Councils*; or that give him the Legislative as well as the Judicial Power over the Universal Church: Though themselves give him the Supreme Judicial Power when there is no General Council.

III. Protestants call those Papists who hold that the

Roman

Roman Pope is rightfully the Governour of the Universal Church on Earth, either as to Legislative or Judicial-executive Power, either with Councils or without. Two things are here included in our Judgment. 1. *That there is no rightful Universal Governour under Christ over all the Church on Earth*, either as to *Legislation*, or *Judgment*: 2. That the *Roman Pope therefore is no such Governour.*

In this third sense now I am to tell you what we Protestants mean by a *Papist* more particularly. And first I must tell you what a *POPE* is, before I can well tell you what a Papist is: Which I shall do, I. *De facto Historically*: II. *De jure* as to the *Power* which he *claimeth.*

I. A long time the Bishops of *Rome* were seldome called *Popes*, and other Bishops were so called as well as they: At first the Bishops of *Rome* were pious persecuted Men, and many of them Martyrs, and usurped no Power over any Churches but their own; which with *Alexandria* were the two first that brake *Ignatius* his Test of Unity, who saith, [*To every Church there is one Altar, and one Bishop with his fellow Presbyter and Deacons.*] But *Rome* having long called her self the Mistris of the World, and being the Seat of the Empire and Senate, and of the Governing Power of the *orbis Romanus*, the Christians there grew greater than others, and the Bishop as it increased kept it under his Power: And when Christians had peace (which was under the far greatest part of the Heathen Emperours, and for the far longest time) the Greatness of *Rome* giving Greatness to that Church, and so to the Bishop, and great opportunity to help other Churches, because the Governing Power of the Empire was there, this Bishop grew to be of *greatest wealth* and *interest*: And in times of Peace the Strife which Christ

once ended was taken up among the Bishops [*which of them should be the greatest:*] And St. *Paul* having taught Christians that they should not *go voluntarily to Law against each other before Heathens*, if there *were but a wise man among them to be an Arbitrator*; the Christians supposing that they had none wiser or fitter than their Bishop, made him their Common *Arbitrator* in things Civil, as well as Ecclesiastical: By which means Custom making it like a Law, Bishops became *de facto Church-Magistrates*: But they had no Power to execute any *Penal Laws*, either *Jewish* or *Roman*, or to make any of their own, except as Arbitrators or Doctors to those that would voluntarily receive them: And they had no Power of Life and Death, nor to dis-member any, nor to beat or scourge them, nor to Fine them or Confiscate their Estates: But being entrusted by *Christ* as his Ministers with the Power of the *Church-Keys*, and by the *People* with the Power of *Civil Arbitrations*, they were by this the *stated Governours of all Christians*; who yet obeyed the *Roman* Heathen Magistrates, but brought none of their own differences voluntarily before them.

And because that Multitudes of Heresies took advantage of the Churches liberty, and swarmed among them to their great weakning and disgrace, and christ had commanded his Servants to serve him in as much *Unity* and *Concord* as they could, duty and necessity drove the Pastors of the Churches to *Correspondencies*, and to *meet together* on all just occasions, and at last to *Associations* for the ordering of these Meetings! In which they agreed in what *Compass* and in what *Place*, or by *whose Call* such Meetings should be held, and what Bishops in those Meetings should *preside* or sit highest, and first speak and subscribe: And usually they thought that to follow the

Order

Order of the Civil Government, and give precedency to those that were Bishops of such Cities as had precedency in the Civil Government, was the most convenient Order: And in these Meetings they agreed on such Canons or Orders for all in that Compass to observe, as they thought best tended to their ends: And having no forcing Power (as is aforesaid) they formed their Impositions on voluntarily penitents so as might serve instead of the Power of the Sword: Even Murderers, Incestuous, Adulterers, they could not punish with Death, Stripes, or Mulcts, and they were loth to disgrace Christianity so much as to accuse such to the Heathen Magistrates; and therefore they laid the greater shame upon them, forbidding them Communion with Christians for so many years as they thought meet, and before they restored them they were humbly to beg the Prayers and Communion of the Church. But yet these Synods were small and few and rare, and never any dreamt of them as a Council of all the Church on Earth.

But when God blessed the *Rome* World with a Christian Emperour after the sharp Persecution of *Diocletian*, and this Emperour had by Religion and Interest made the *Christian Souldiers* his *chief confidents* or *strength*, he studied the utmost *increase of the Christians*, and to that end invited all to Christianity, by the favour of the Court, and by such Honours, Commands, Wealth, and Dignities, as they were capable of; and above all he exalted the Christian Bishops, whom he *found* the Rulers of the Christian Societies: He gave them Honours, and Wealth, and Power: He made a Law that no Christians should be forced to go to the Civil Heathen Judicatures, from their Bishops, and gave Power to the Bishops to be the Christians Judges, some few hainous Crimes being in time excepted:

excepted: And so the Bishops were by *his Law* made *Civil Magistrates* or *Arbitrators*; yet not with any Power of Life, or Limbs, or Estate: So that all that would become Christians, and would be subject to the Bishops Canons and Church Discipline, were freed from Death, Stripes, and Mulcts, for many Crimes which all others were lyable to, and Excommunication and some Penance was instead of all: By such means Multitudes of worldly Men, and by the Preaching of the Gospel Multitudes that were found Christians, came together into the Churches: And Bishopricks being now very desirable for their Power, Honour, and Wealth, Men that most loved *Power*, *Honour*, and *Wealth*, (that is, *Proud*, *Worldly*, *Carnal Men*) did earnestly seek them, and strive for Precedency in them: But yet while the People had the choice, or a Negative therein, and the old Spirit of Christianity remained in many of the Bishops, in many places bad ones were kept out, and many excellent Men were preferred.

The Heresie of *Arrius* and the *Alexandrian* Contentions thereabout, required a remedy for the Churches Peace: The Bishops could not end it themselves: It spread so far that it was *Constantine's* great grief to see Christians so quickly disgrace themselves, and weaken their Religion in the Eyes of the Heathens: Therefore he called a Council of Bishops consisting mostly of those of the Eastern parts where the troubles arose: Two Priests of *Rome* were there, but not the Bishop, nor but few of the West: Where the Emperours open Rebukes and Lamentation for their Contention, and his earnest Exhortation to Peace, and his burning all the Libells or Accusations which the Bishops brought in against each other, and his continual presence and moderating oversight

ſight of them, brought that meeting at laſt to that good and peaceable End, which elſe it was never like to have attained.

It never came into *Conſtantine*'s mind to call this Council as an Univerſal Repreſentative of the whole Chriſtian World, or as the Governours of the Churches that were out of his Dominions; but as a fit expedient to end the ſtrife that was raiſed in thoſe Parts: For as few of the Weſt were there, ſo none of all other Kingdoms were once called. For who ſhould call them? *Conſtantine* that called the Council neither did it, nor ever pretended to a power to do it. The Pope called not the Council, much leſs did he call the reſt of the Chriſtian World: *Socrates* tells us, *l.* 1. *c.* 15. that St. *Thomas* had Preached to the *Parthians*, and *Bartholomew* to the *Indians*, and *Matthew* to the *Ethiopians*, though the middle *India* was not Converted till *Conſtantine*'s days, by *Frumentius*, and *Edeſius*, and *Iberia* by a Maid:] And ſo *Euſeb. l.* 3. *c.* 3. who ſaith, that St. *Andrew* Preached to the *Scythians*; and *in Vit. Conſtant. l.* 4. *c.* 8. that there were many Churches in *Perſia*: And no doubt theſe Apoſtles Preached not in vain; *Scotland* and other Countries that were out of the *Roman* Empire had Churches. Yet any Neighbour Biſhop that deſired it, might voluntarily be preſent. When *Theodoret* (in his Life) tells us that [*James* Biſhop of *Niſibis* (in the borders of *Perſia*) was *at the Council of* Nice: *For* Niſibis *was then under the Government of the* Roman *Empire*,] he plainly intimateth that none but the Subjects of the Empire were called: And the names yet viſible, of the Subſcribers prove it.

Notwithſtanding this Councils deciſions, the Contentions continue, and the Major part of the Biſhops went

went that way usually as the Emperours went: And so in the Reign of *Constantius*, and *Valens*, they most turned to the *Arrians*, at least in words: And many General Councils (so called, of the Empire) the *Arrians* had, in which they prevailed, and made Creeds for their turn as they at *Nice* had done against them, and brought Persecution on the Orthodox, silencing, and ejecting them, and scattering their Meetings as prohibited Conventicles, the Emperour himself sometime executing their dispersions and restraint: And among other *Liberius* the Bishop of *Rome*, against his Conscience Subscribed to them.

The Fathers at the Council of *Nice* did determine of the bounds of the Patriarchs of the Empire, which being at first but three, (*Rome*, *Alexandria*, and *Antioch*,) *Jerusalem* was after added, and after that *Constantinople*: For *Constantine* having now strengthned himself by the Christian Interest, and being further out of the danger of mutable Souldiers, than his Predecessours, did that which none of them was ever able to do, by removing the Imperial Seat from *Rome* to *Constantinople*, and so leaving that Famous City as naked and almost neglected: Whereby two great changes befell the Clergie; 1. The Bishop of *Rome* was left more absolute and uncontrouled in the West; 2. And the Bishop of *Constantinople* set up against him for the *Primacy* in the Empire: At first he claimed but an *Equality*, but afterward a *Priority as Universal Bishop*, because his Seat was the Imperial Seat.

The Patriarch of *Jerusalem* was so far from the Court, and of so small power, that he made the least stir of any of the five, though he had the fairest pretense incomparably for a claim of Supremacy on Religious reasons, if a *Supreme* there must have been (*Christ* himself having been there a *Minister to the Circumcision*, and Shepherd

of

of the Sheep of the Houſe of *Iſrael*, and his Kinſman *James* then Biſhop after, and that being the *Mother-Church* out of which ſprung all the reſt.) But the other four Patriarchs (eſpecially three of them) became as ſo many *Generals of Armies* militating frequently againſt each other: and he that got the *ſtronger* Party of Biſhops and Court-favourers carryed all, againſt the reſt. But no place more turbulent, nor no Biſhop more unquiet than thoſe of *Alexandria*: Pride and Worldlineſs now grew apace, and ſo corrupted the Clergie, that in their Synods the *fleſhly* part too oft prevailed againſt the *ſpiritual*! When Court and Councils were for the *Arrians*, the whole Eaſtern part of the Empire was embroiled in the Contention, and the Orthodox in the greater Biſhopricks caſt out: When they were down and caſt out themſelves, the temporizing and turbulent Biſhops uſually got the Major Vote: Excellent *Gregory Nazianzen* for the great ſervice that he had done againſt the *Arrians* was choſen by the People, and made Patriarch of *Conſtantinople*: But the Synod of Biſhops envyed him and rejected him, to whom he gave place and would not ſtrive. *Dioſcorus* of *Alexandria* and his party fought it out at the General Council, and killed *Flavianus*: And being after overcome and outed of his Seat, did ſtill claim and keep the Title with his followers, and the moſt of his Patriarchate of the People ſtuck to him; ſo that he propagated his Opinion and Intereſt in all thoſe remote parts of the Empire: Yea among Volunteers in *Ethiopia* and other *extra*-imperial parts, which no Law or Canon had ſubjected to him; while the Patriarch that ſucceeded him by the Councils Decree, had his party only as the reſt, *within the Empire*: So that to this day the *Syrians*, *Ethiopians*, and abundance others profeſs themſelves the

followers of *Dioscorus* as the true Bishop injuriously, say they, cast out.

Chrysostome afterwards was cast out of his Patriarchate of *Constantinople*, by a Synod of Bishops and the Court.

At *Rome* the Bishoprick was such a prey, that contending for it troubled the Publick Peace: At the choice of *Damasus* they fought it out in the Church, and his party won that sacred Field, leaving many Carcasses there to the Church-Communion of the dead.

But it became the great advantage of *Rome*, that when the Empire was divided, the Western Emperour proved Orthodox while the Eastern were oft *Arrians*: Which kept up the honour of the Western Bishops who had not the temptations of the East; where sharp persecutions and the desolation of their Flocks, and the boast of the *Arrians* as the Major part, that was also setled by Authority, caused the ejected Bishops sometime to solicite them of the West for help, by sending them some to acquaint the *Arrians* that their Cause was owned by the Western Bishops, or to put some Countenance on their depressed Cause (and indeed the Western Emperour did rescue them.) This occasioneth the Papists to this day to pretend that this was an Act of their subjection to the Pope: St. *Basil* was the chief in this solicitation, and you shall read his words (Translated.)

"*Verily the manners of proud men* (speaking of the "Western Bishops) *use to grow more insolent, if they be* "*honoured: And if God be merciful to us, what other ad-* "*dition have we need of? but if Gods anger remain on us,* "*what help can the pride of the west bring us? when they* "*neither know the truth, nor can endure to speak it; but* "*being prepossessed with false suspicions they do the same* "*things now which they did in the Case of* Marcellus, *con-*

"*tentiously*

" *tentiously disputing against those that taught the truth,* " *but for Heresie confirming it by their Authority?* Indeed I " was willing, (*not as representing the Publick Person of* " *the East*) *to write to their Leader* (Damasus) *but not* " *about Church-matters; but that I might intimate that* " *they neither knew the truth of the things that are done* " *with us, nor did admit the way by which they might learn* " *them. And in-general, that they should not insult over* " *the calamitous and afflicted, nor think that Pride did* " *make for their dignity, when that one sin alone is enough* " *to make us hateful to God.* But this Epistle of *Basil Andr. Schottus* the Jesuite left out of *Basil*'s Works when he published them, *Antw. Lat. A. D.* 1616. *Tertullian* had made as bold with the Bishop of *Rome* long before, *lib. de Pudic. pag.* 742. against *Zepherinus*: So had *Cyprian* and *Firmilian* against *Stephen*: *Hilary Pictav.* with *Liberius* and the Councils, even that of *Nice*: But most notable was the sharp Contest of the *Carthage* Council, of which *Augustine* was one, against *Zosimus*, and *Boniface* and *Celestine*; when the Pope falsly alledged a Canon of the *Nicene* Council for Appeal to *Rome*, they denyed his claim, and evinced the forgery, and stood it out against him to the last.

I. And here you may see that they took not the Pope's Power to be of God (*jure divino:*) For they searched only all the Archives to find out the *true Copies of the Nicene Council*, (*Pisanus* Canons being not then made;) and did not go to the *Scripture* to decide the Case, nor to *Tradition Apostolical*, only pleading *Church-Laws* and *Order* as on their side.

And that they never dreamt of a *Divine Institution* of this *Roman* Papacy or Primacy, but only as the Arch-Bishop of *Canterbury* in *England* hath precedency by the

King's Laws, and not by God's; so *Rome* was the first Seat by the meer appointment of man, even Emperours and Councils, is yet fully evident; 1. In that the *same Power* that made the other *four Patriarchs*, made the Bishop of *Rome* a Patriarch; and he was not made Pope or *Prime Patriarch* before he was made *Patriarch:* But no man dreameth of a Divine Institution of the *other four* Patriarchs: *Ergo.*

2. Because the whole Eastern Church, which was far greater than the Western, first equalled the Patriarch of *Constantinople* to him of *Rome*, and after preferred him; when yet they never dreamed of a Divine Institution of the Patriarchate of *Constantinople*: For it was but lately made: And no man of reason can judge, that all the Catholick Emperours, Bishops, and People of the far greatest part of the Imperial Church, would professedly equal or prefer a *Humane* Office before one which they believed to be of *Divine* Institution.

3. To this day all the *Greek* Church shew themselves to be of that judgment, by adhering to the Patriarch of *Constantinople*, whom they confess to have been made such by Emperours and Councils. And in the Contest with them the case is commonly pleaded accordingly.

4. *Gregory Nazianzen* would never have wished so earnestly that there were no *inequality*, *superiority*, or *priority of Seats*, if he had taken them to be of Divine Institution: Durst he have so opposed the Law and Order of God?

5. But to put all out of doubt, it is expressly determined by the most famous General Councils, even two of the four which are likened to the four Gospels, *Constantinople* and *Calcedon*, that the Primacy was given to *Rome* by the *Fathers* (so they called Councils) *because it*

was

was the Imperial Seat; and therefore they give *equal* Priviledges to *Constantinople*, because it is the Imperial Seat. The words of the Council of *Calcedon* (oft cited) are these (translated.)

Act. 16. Binii pag. 134. [" *we following always the* " *definitions of the holy Fathers and the Canons, and know-* " *ing those that have now been read of the* 150 *Bishops most* " *beloved of God, that were congregated under the Empe-* " *rour, of pious memory,* Theodosius *the Greater, in the* " *Royal City of* Constantinople, *New* Rome, *have our* " *selves also defined the same things, concerning the Pri-* " *viledges of the same most holy Church of* Constantino- " ple, *New* Rome: *For to the Seat of old* Rome, *because* " *of the Empire of that City, the Fathers consequently gave* " *the Priviledges. And the* 150 *Bishops most beloved of* " *God, being moved with the same intentions, have given* " *equal Priviledges to the most holy Seat of New* Rome; " *reasonably judging that the City adorned with the Em-* " *pire and Senate, shall enjy equal Priviledges with old* " *Regal* Rome.

This *Council* was called by the Emperour *Martian*; and his Lay-Officers were called the Judges: And the Bishops, to shew what they thought of *Rome*, cryed out [*They that contradict it are Nestorians: Let them that contradict it walk to* Rome. *Bin. p.* 98.]

If such a General Council *be not to be believed*, farewell all the Papists Infallibility, Authority, Tradition, and Religion: If it *be to be believed*, the Pope is a Humane Creature, and not a Divine.

But *Binius* saith, that *Rome receiveth not the Canons of this Council* of *Constantinople*, which this confirmeth, *but only their condemnation of* Macedonius: And he saith [*That every Council hath just so much strength and autho-*

rity

rity as the Apoſtolick See beſtoweth on it: For (ſaith he) *unleſs this be admitted, no reaſon can be given why ſome Councils of greater numbers of Biſhops were reprobated, and others of a ſmaller number confirmed,*] Vol. 2. p. 515. And yet muſt we hear the noiſe of [*all the Chriſtian World, and all the Biſhops, and General Councils, and the Tradition of our Fore-fathers, &c.*] as againſt us, when all is but the *Pope of Rome, and ſuch as pleaſe him*? and it is *He* and his *Pleaſers* that refuſe the moſt General Councils and Tradition? Away with this falſe deceitful talk.

6. Once more hear their own Confeſſion; Their late Engliſh Biſhop (of *Calcedon*, a fatal name) *R. Smyth* in his Survey againſt Biſhop *Bromhall* ſaith, *cap.* 5. [*To us it ſufficeth, that the Biſhop of* Rome *is S.* Peter's *Succeſſor, and this all the Fathers teſtifie, and all the Catholick Church believeth: But whether it be* jure divino *or* humano *is no point of Faith.*]

Anſ. 1. Is not that a point of your *Faith* which the General Councils affirm? at leaſt of your Religion? Who can tell then what is your Faith? 2. If an *hiſtorical* point be not to be believed from *General Councils*, why ſhould the Hiſtory of *Peter*'s being at *Rome*, and Biſhop there, be believed as from *Fathers*? (which *Nilus* hath ſaid ſo much againſt.) 3. Do not the Fathers as much agree that *Peter* was *firſt Biſhop of Antioch*? If then you have no more to ſhew than they, where is your Title? 4. If your *Divine Right* of ſucceeding *Peter* be no point of Faith, then he that believeth it not, doth not ſin againſt any point that God would have him believe as from him, and therefore is not to be thought erroneous in the Faith. 5. And yet upon this, which is *no point of Faith*, you build your *Faith* and *Church*, and would have all Chriſtians do the like, on pain of damnation.

II. And

II. And as the *Roman Primacy* was but of *Man's deviſing*, ſo I next prove, that it was but *over one Empire*, unleſs any Neighbours for their own advantage did afterward voluntarily ſubject themſelves. 1. Becauſe the Powers that gave him his Primacy, extended but to the Empire. The Emperour and his Subjects ruled not other Lands.

2. Becauſe the four other Patriarchs, made by the ſame Power, had no power without the Empire: As appeareth by the diſtribution of their Provinces in the Council of *Nice*, and afterward: *Piſanus*'s Canons we regard not, that take in *Ethiopia*.

Obj. *The* Abaſſins *now receive their chief Biſhop from the Patriarch of* Alexandria.

That proveth not that ever they were under *Rome*: For there is not the leaſt proof that ever they did ſo, till *Dioſcorus* and his Succeſſors ſeparated from *Rome*, being rejected by them as Hereticks, and by long and ſlow degrees enlarged their power over many Neighbour Volunteers.

3. Becauſe the *General Councils* in which the Pope preſided, were but of the Empire. And the Popes never claimed a more general extenſive power then, than the *Councils*: Who indeed with the Emperours made the Papacy in its firſt ſtate.

4. Becauſe when the Patriarch of *Conſtantinople* claimed the Primacy, yea called himſelf *Univerſal Biſhop*, which *Gregory* ſharply reprehendeth as Antichriſtian, yet he never claimed the Government of the whole Chriſtian World, but only of the Empire. And in all their Conteſts there is no intimation of any ſuch different Claim of the Competitors, as if *Rome* claimed *all the World*, and *Conſtantinople* but the Empire, or *Roman* World:.

World: Their Conteſt was about the ſame Churches or Circuit, who ſhould be Chief.

5. The Inſtances of the ſeveral Countries that were never under the Pope, do prove it: Even the great Empire of *Abaſſia*, and all the reſt fore-named without the Empire. Of which and the Exception more under the next.

III. The *General Councils* were all ſo called only in reſpect to the generality of the Empire, and not as of all the Chriſtian World; which was never dreamed of. Proved,

1. Becauſe the Emperours that called them (*Conſtantine*, *Martian*, *&c.*) had no power out of the Empire.

2. There is no credible Hiſtory that mentioneth any further call; much leſs of all the Chriſtian World.

3. It was the Affairs only of the Empire that the Councils judged of, as is to be ſeen in all their Canons.

4. The Names of the Biſhops yet to be ſeen, as Subſcribers, fully prove it.

5. It was not a thing probable, if poſſible, that the *Indians*, *Perſians*, and other Nations, ſhould ſend their Biſhops into the *Roman* Empire, which was uſually at War with them, or dreaded and deteſted by them.

6. *Theodoret*'s foreſaid words of *James* Biſhop of *Niſibis* ſheweth it [*that he was at the Council of* Nice, *for* Niſibis *was then under the Roman Empire.*]

7. I have oft cited the words of *Reynerius*, ſaying, that the outer Churches planted by the Apoſtles were not *under the Church of Rome.*

8. The *executive* part neither could, nor ever was performed upon the Churches without the Empire. When did any Patriarch, or any Provincial, or General Coun-

cil

cil send for any Bishop or other person out of *India*, *Scythia*, *Ethiopia*, or any other exterior Nation, to answer any Accusation? or pass any Sentence of Deposition, or Suspension against them? or put any other into their places?

9. General Councils are confessed by Papists to be but a *Humane* and not a *Divine Institution*: and what Humane Power could settle them in and over the Church Universal? If you say It is by *Universal Consent*; prove to us that ever there *was* such a *Consent*, or that ever there was any meeting or treaty for such Consent, of all the Christian World, and we will yield it to you. Surely if there be any Christians at the *Antipodes* they were not sent to in those days when *Lactantius*, *Augustine*, and others, denyed that there were any *Antipodes*, and derided it; nor when the Pope by our Countryman *Boniface* his Instigation excommunicated *Virgilius* for holding that there were *Antipodes*. Hear their great disputer *Pighius*, *Hierarch. Eccles. lib. 6. c. 1. fol. 230.* [*General Councils* (saith he) *have not a Divine or Supernatural Original, but meerly an Humane Original, and are the Invention of* Constantine *a Prince; profitable indeed sometimes to find out in Controversie which is the Orthodox and Catholick Truth, though to this they are not necessary, seeing it is a readier way to advise with the Apostolick Seat.*] So that General Councils are *Novel*, *Humane*, and only of the *Empire* then.

10. But to end all the Controversie, the names of the Subscribers are yet to be seen, who were not the representatives of the Christian World, but of the *Empire*, as is notorious.

Æneas Sylvius Epist. 288. saith that [*before the Council of Nice there was little respect had to the Church of*

Rome.] And though when he was made Pope, Intereſt cauſed him to revoke his judgment of the Councils being above the Pope, he never revoked ſuch hiſtorical narratives.

Their great Learned Mathematical (yet militant) Cardinal *Cuſanus li. de Concord. Cathol. c.* 13. *&c.* ſaith [*that the Papacie is but of Poſitive right, and that Prieſts are* jure Divino *equal, and that it is ſubjectional Conſent which giveth the Pope and Biſhops their Majority, and that the diſtinction of Dioceſes, and that a Biſhop be over Presbyters are of Poſitive Right, and that Chriſt gave no more to* Peter *than the reſt; and that if the congregate Church ſhould chuſe the Biſhop of* Trent *for their Preſident and Head, he ſhould be more properly* Peter's *Succeſſor than the Biſhop of* Rome.]

Object. *Oh but this Book is diſallowed by the Pope.*

Anſw. No wonder: So is all that is againſt him.

The Exceptions which we grant are theſe. 1. There were ſome Cities of the Empire that were near to other Nations, where the Princes being Heathens, Chriſtians were underlings and few: And the Biſhops of theſe Cities extended their care to as many of the Neighbour Countries as would voluntarily ſubmit to them: So the Biſhop of *Tomys* was Biſhop of many *Scythians*, and ſo ſome that were on the Borders of *Perſia*, had many *Perſians*, and were at *Nice*.

2. There were ſome Countries that were ſometimes under the *Roman* Power, and ſometime under the *Perſian*, or others, as Victory carried it; and theſe when they had been once of the Imperial Church, took it (when they fell under Heathens) to be their Honour, Strength, and Priviledge to be ſo accounted ſtill, and ſo would come to their Councils after if they could: So it was with

with the *Armenians*; and the *Africans*, when the *Gothes* had conquered them, *&c.*

3. There were ſome Biſhops that lived on the Borders of the Empire, under Heathens, that needed the help of Neighbour Churches, and accordingly were oft with them, craving their help: So it was with the old *Britans*, as to the Biſhops of *France*.

4. There were ſome ſmall Countries adjoining to the Empire, who took the Friendſhip of the *Roman* Power for their great Honour and ſafety, and therefore were glad to conform in Religion to the Empire, and to let their Biſhops join with them.

5. And there were ſome Neighbour Countries who were turned to Chriſtianity by the Emiſſaries of the Biſhop of *Rome*; who therefore (rejoicing alſo in ſo powerful a Patronage) were willingly his Subjects: But this was long after the firſt great Councils. Theſe two laſt were the *Saxons* caſe in *England*. Accordingly you may ſometimes find two or three out of ſuch Countries at ſome of the General Councils of the Empire. Which yet were called *General* but as to the *Empire*, and not as to the World.

To proceed in the Hiſtory: When Chriſtians were (moſtly) exempted from the Magiſtrates Judicatures (that were moſt Heathens, though under a Chriſtian Prince,) and ſo the *Biſhops Canons* were to them, as the *Laws of the Land* are to us, it is no wonder that Councils muſt then be very frequent, and Canons of great eſteem; and hereupon Biſhops by proſperity growing more and more worldly and carnal, made uſe of their Synodical Power, as is aforeſaid, to accompliſh their own Wills: So that the Synods of Biſhops became the great Incendiaries and Troublers of the Empire. You need no more

to satisfie you of this, but to read the Acts of the Councils, and the words of *Nazianzen* (called *Theologus*) against Synods and contentious Bishops, and the sad Exclamations of *Hillary Pictav.* They that had too little zeal against Ungodliness, Unrighteousness, Pride, and Malice, were so zealous against any that withdrew from their Power and contradicted them, that they easily stigmatized them for Hereticks, and made even godly sober Christians suspected of Heresie for their sakes; while notorious Vice was used gently in those that adhered unto them. Even holy *Augustine* saith [*Drunkenness is a mortal sin, si sit assidua, if it be daily or constant*; (what, not else?) *and that they must not be roughly and sharply dealt with, but gently and by fair words*:] Vid. Aquin. 22. q. 150. a. 1. 4. ad 4. & a. 2. 1.

And their Great *Gregory*, [*That with leave they must be left to their own wit*, (or disposition,) *lest they grow worse if they be pulled away from such a Custom*,] (as Drunkenness.)

But when it came to such as withdrew from under them, they were not so gentle. *Lucifer Calaritanus* is made the Head of a Heresie, because he was but too much against the receiving of such as had been *Arrians*. The large Catalogues of Heresies contain many that never erred in Fundamentals. They prosecuted the *Priscillianists* so hotly, that if godly men were but given to fasting and strictness of life, they were brought into suspicion of Priscillianism: And the Vulgar took advantage of the Bishops turbulency and ill disposition to abuse the godly. S. *Martin* therefore separated from the whole Synod of the Bishops about him, and neither would join with them, nor have any Communion with them, as supposing them proud men that suppressed piety, and strengthened the wicked,

wicked, by their intemperate profecution: Whereupon they fuſpected and accuſed him alſo as an unlearned Fellow, and a Favourer of the Priſcillianiſts. They did not only bring in the uſe of the Magiſtrates Sword in Religion againſt Hereſie, which *Martin* could not bear, but they owned and flattered an uſurping Emperour, that they might have the help of his Sword to do their work: So that in all thoſe parts of *France*, *Germany*, and the Borders of *Italy*, I find not a Biſhop that refuſed to own the Uſurper, ſave S. *Ambroſe*, and *Martin*, and one *French* Biſhop: And *Sulpitius Severus* tells us that they were men too bad themſelves, and that upon his knowledge *Ithacius* the Leader of them ſcarce cared what he ſaid or did. S. *Cyril* at *Alexandria* is noted by *Socrates* as the firſt Biſhop there that uſed the Sword; and his Kinſman S. *Theophilus* went beyond him, and took upon him even to favour the Errour of the *Anthropomorphites*, that he might have their help againſt ſuch as he hated, and proſecuted *Chryſoſtom* till he had procured his ejection, which made a rupture in that Church, and cauſed the ſeparation of his Adherents, whom the Biſhop would have taken for a new Sect, and called them *Joannites*; ſuch skill had the domineering ſort of Prelates in making and multiplying Hereſies and Sects; and calling themſelves ſtill the Catholick Biſhops becauſe they kept the upper hand, and major Vote, except where the *Arrians* over-topt them, who then claimed the Catholick Title to themſelves. And by what Arts ſome of them kept the favour of the Emperours, to do their work and keep up their greatneſs, *Socrates* tells you in the inſtance of the ſaid S. *Theophilus*, who ſent one before the great Battel between *Theodoſius* and *Eugenius* another Uſurper, with two Letters, and a rich Preſent, and bid him ſtay till the

Battel

Battel was over, and then give the flattering Letter and the Present to him whoever that got the better.

But though still since the *world* came into the Church, and the Greatness, Power, and Honour of Prelacy made that Office a very alluring bait to the desires of the most worldly fleshly men, yet God kept up some that maintained their integrity, and bare their testimony against the pride and carnality of the rest; and though the scandals of the Catholicks turned many to the *Novatians*, and other Sects that profest more strictness, (yea *Salvian* makes the *Arrians*, *Gothes*, and *Vandals* themselves to be men of more honesty, and temperance than the Catholick Clergie) yet sound Doctrine had still some holy Men that did maintain it.

But what were the *Popes* doing all this while? Sound Doctrine by the advantage of the soundness of the Western Emperour as is said, yet kept out Arrianism, Pelagianisme and such other Heresies there: but they were still striving to be the *Greatest*: *Leo* one of the best of them was one of the first that laid claim to an Universal Headship within the Empire: I told you how *Zosimus* and his Followers strove with the *Africans*, to have Appeals made to *Rome* from the *African* Bishops and Councils: which the *Africans* stifly opposed as contrary to the Canons, to Custom, and to the reason of Discipline, which required that Cases should be judged and ended where persons and things were known, and not by Strangers afar off, where Witnesses could not without intolerable charge and trouble be brought beyond Sea to prosecute the suite. The words of the *African* Council translated are these: ["Let your Holiness, as beseemeth you, repel the "wicked refuges of Presbyters and the Clergie that follow "them, because this is not taken from the *African* Church

by

" by any definitions of the Fathers, and the *Nicene* De-
" crees did moſt plainly commit both the inferior Clergie
" and the Biſhops themſelves, to the Metropolitans: for
" they did moſt prudently and moſt juſtly provide that
" all buſineſs ſhould be ended in the very places where
" they began, and the Grace of the Holy Ghoſt will not
" (or ſhould not) be wanting to each province: which
" Equity ſhould by the Prieſts of Chriſt be prudently ob-
" ſerved, and moſt conſtantly maintained: eſpecially be-
" cauſe it is granted to every one to appeal to the Coun-
" cils of their own Province, or to an Univerſal Council,
" if he be offended with the ſentence of the Cognitors:
" unleſs there ſhould be any one that can think that our
" God can (or will) inſpire a Juſtice of tryal into any *One*
" *Man*, and deny it to innumerable Prieſts that are Con-
" gregated in Council. Or how can that ſentence that
" is paſt beyond Seas be valid, to which the neceſſary
" perſons of the Witneſſes could not be brought, becauſe
" of the infirmities of Sexe or Age, many other impedi-
" ments intervening? For that any (that is *Legates*)
" ſhould be ſent from the ſide of your Holineſs we find
" not conſtituted by any Synod of the Fathers (*it ſeems*
" *they never thought* of a *Divine right*) becauſe that which
" you ſent us by our Fellow Biſhop *Fauſtinus* as done by
" the *Nicene* Council --- (*they prove was falſe*) --- ſend
" not your Clergy Executors (or *Agitators*) to potent
" men: Do not yield to it, leſt we ſeem to bring the Se-
" cular arrogancy into the Church of Chriſt, which pre-
" ferreth the light of ſimplicity and day of humility for
" them that deſire to ſee God: For of our Brother *Fau-*
" *ſtinus* (*the Popes Legate*) we are ſecure that the ſafe
" Brotherly love in your Holineſſes honeſty and mode-
" ration, can ſuffer him to ſtay no longer in *Africa*.]

The

The Popes took this heinously from the *Africans*; that they should stop them in their ascent to the Universal Monarchy: So that Pope *Boniface*, *Epist. ad Eulal.* saith, [" Aurelius *sometimes Bishop of* Carthage, *with his* " *Colleagues, did begin by the Devils instigation to wax* " *proud against the Church of* Rome, *in the days of our* " *Predecessors* Boniface *and* Celestine.] O how little do proud men instigated by the Devil know themselves, when they think that the Diabolical pride is in them that will not serve their pride!

And *Harding* against *Jewel*, *Art.* 4. *Sect.* 19. saith [*After the whole* African *Church had persevered in Schism, the space of twenty years, and had removed themselves from the obedience of the Apostolick Seat, being seduced by* Aurelius *Bishop of* Carthage, *&c.*]

Here note, 1. That so numerous were the Bishops in *Africa*, that one of their Provincial Councils had far more Bishops than the Council of *Trent*, or divers others called General. 2. That they were men of the most eminent learning and piety, and that had kept up Discipline above almost any Church in the Empire. S. *Augustine* was one that subscribed the foresaid Letter: and were such Men like to be seduced by *Aurelius*? 3. Note with what Impudencie even such men as *Harding* yet pretend that St *Augustine* was for their Papal Claim, when yet he professeth him to be one of the Schismaticks that cast off obedience to the Seat of *Rome*. 4. Note what good Company we have in our reproach of the same pretended Schism. 5. Note how shamelesly the Papists still tell us of *all the Bishops of the Christian World* being for them, and asking us, *where was our Church before Luther*, that is, a *Society* of *Christians that obeyed not the Pope*; when they confess that *Augustine* and all the *African* Church for twenty years

years obeyed him not: (and alas, ſoon after the *Vandals* came and conquered them, and perſecuted and deſtroyed thoſe famous Biſhops that did ſurvive.)

And that you may further know that they had yet more diſobedient Reſiſters than *African* Biſhops, you may remember that even the *Egyptian* Monks, ſo long famous for their great auſterity and ſanctity, had renounced not only obedience but Communion with the Pope and his Adherents: *Fulgentius* was about going to live with them for their holineſs, but he was told of this, and turned his courſe: *vid. Vit. Fulgent.*

And how great were all thoſe Churches of *Æthiopia, Armenia* (*exterior*) *India, and the reſt which the Apoſtles converted*, which *Reynerius* aforeſaid truly ſaith, *are not under the Church of* Rome? *Cont. Waldenſ. Catal. in Biblioth. Patr. To.* 1. *p.* 773.

I have formerly recited the words of *Melch. Canus*, one "of their great Biſhops, ſaying [*Loc. Theolog. li.* 6. *c.* 7. *fol.* "201. *Not only the* Greeks, *but almoſt* ALL THE REST "OF THE BISHOPS OF THE WHOLE WORLD "*have vehemently fought to deſtroy the priviledge of the* "*Church of* Rome. *And indeed they had on their ſide both* "*the Arms of Emperours, and the* GREATER NUM- "BER OF CHURCHES; *and yet they could never prevail to abrogate the Power of the one Pope of* Rome.

See here their own Confeſſion, 1. Where Chriſtians oppoſing the Pope were before *Luther*. 2. And of what credit their boaſt of Univerſality and Catholick Tradition is. One while (*W. H.*) ſaith, *The Biſhops of the whole world* were for them: But when their cauſe leads them to tell truth, they ſay, *Almoſt all the Biſhops of the whole world have vehemently fought againſt the Pope*, and the Arms of *Emperors and the greater number of Churches were againſt them.*

And indeed, if it had been none but the *Greeks*, he might well have said [*The greater number of Churches:*] For the Conteſt which begun upon the Emperours removal to *Conſtantinople*, and at the firſt General Council, increaſing more and more, till *Gregory* oppoſed *John*'s Claim of Univerſal Biſhop, as Antichriſtian, at laſt *Phocas* the cruel murderer of *Mauritius* gave the Title to the Biſhop of *Rome*: But that no whit ended the conteſt, following Emperors being contrary minded, and the *Greeks* continuing their Claim, the Biſhops of *Rome* and *Conſtantinople* excommunicating one another; ſo that by this abominable ſtriving which ſhould be the Chief or Greateſt, the Churches that were of old in the Empire have been divided, and ſo they continue to this very Day, as unreconcileable as ever.

And when *Gregory* ſent his Emiſſary hither to Preach to the *Saxons*, they found the Chriſtian *Britans* and *Scots* not only averſe to the Government, Orders, and Ceremonies of *Rome* (ſo that in many Kings Reigns neither words nor force could make them yield) but alſo ſuch as refuſed their Communion, and would not ſo much as eat and drink with them in the ſame houſe.

No wonder then that *Marinarius* at the Council of *Trent* complain, *that the Church is ſhut up in the Corners of* Europe: and that *Sonnius* Biſhop of *Antwerp* ſay (*Demonſtr. Relig. Chriſt.* li. 2. Tract. 5. c. 3.) [*I pray you what room hath the Catholick Church now in the habitable World?*] *Scarce three Elns long in compariſon of the vaſtneſs which the Satanical Church doth poſſeſs.*

The truth is, ſaith *Brierwood*, *Divide the known World* (and alas how much is unknown?) *into thirty parts, and about nineteen are Heathens, and ſix Mahometans, and five*

five Christians of all sorts: And of these Christians the Papists at this day are as some think about a fifth part, some think a fourth part, and some think a third part.

And after the assuming of the Universal Title, their Popes more and more degenerated to such odious wickedness at last as we hope few Pagans are guilty of: which we speak, not as from Enemies, but from their own Historians and Flatterers, such as *Platina*, *Baronius*, *Genebrard*, *&c.* Nay, not so much from them as from Councils General and Provincial which have accused, condemned, and deposed them. Read in my *Key for Catholicks* pag. 220, 221, 222. the words of *Baronius*, *Genebrard*, *Platina*: *CL. Espensæus*, *Com. Muss*, *Guicciardine*, &c. *Nic. Clemangis*, *Bernard*, *Alv. Pelagius* say more. Let any impartial man but read the Articles on which the Council at *Constance* condemned and deposed *John* 23. about 70 in number, in which they make him almost as bad as a man out of Hell can be, and indeed say, he was commonly called, [*The Devil incarnate.*]

Read the Articles on which the Council at *Basil* condemned and deposed *Eugenius the Fourth as a perjured wretch*, *an obstinate Heretick*, and all the rest.

Read the Articles on which another Council deposed *John* 13. *alias* 12. And read the Lives of many more in their own Historians.

And what came the *Church* to when it had such Heads? when *Baronius* saith, *ad an.* 912. that [*the face of the holy Roman Church was exceeding filthy: when the most potent Whores did rule at* Rome, *by whose pleasure Seats were changed, Bishops were given, and which is a thing horrid to be heard, and not to be spoken, their Lovers were thrust into* Peters *Chair, being false Popes, who are not to be written in the Catalogue of the Roman Popes, but only for*

the marking of such times: And *what kind of Cardinals, Priests, and Deacons, think you, we must imagine, that these Monsters did chuse, when nothing is so rooted in Nature as for every one to beget his like.*] For *near* 150 *years*, saith *Genebrard*, *about fifty Popes were rather Apostatical than Apostolical.*]

And where was their *uninterrupted Succession all this time*?

Pope *Nicolas* in his *Decretals Caranz. p.* 393. 395) saith [*He that by Money or the favour of Men, or Popular or Military Tumults is intruded into the Apostolical Seat, without the Concordant and Canonical Election of the Cardinals and the following religious Clergy, let him not be taken for a Pope nor Apostolical, but Apostatical.*] And of the Clergy he saith [*Priests that commit Fornication cannot have the honour of Priesthood*;] Yea, [*Let no Man hear Mass of a Priest whom he certainly knoweth to have a Concubine or Woman introduced.*] (And shall not *Protestants forgive* those that will not hear such, or as bad?) Where then was the Papacy under such?

For above forty years together there were more Popes than one at once, and sometimes more than two, one dwelling at *Rome*, and another at *Avignion*, or elsewhere: One set up and obeyed by one Party, and another by another Party, each condemning the other as an Usurper. And had the Universal Church then any *one Head*? And with what wickedness are they charged, one destroying what the other was for; see in *Wernerus Fascial.* and my *Key p.* 28, 29, 30.

Wernerus and others say, that *Silvester the second was made Pope by the help of the Devil to whom he did homage, that all might go as he would have it --- but he quickly met with the End that such have that place their hope in deceitful*

teitful Devils.] When one Pope cuts another in pieces, and casteth his Carcass into the Water, as unworthy of Christian Burial (as you may find in the Lives of *Formosus* and *Sergius*) must we yet suppose such the Lawful Rulers of the World?

The fourteenth Schisme (saith *Wernerus*) *was scandalous and full of confusion, between* Benedict *the Ninth* and five others: *which* Benedict *was wholly vitious, and therefore being damned, appeared in a monstrous and horrid shape, his Head and Tail were like an Asses, the rest of his Body like a Bear, saying, I thus appear because I lived like a Beast. In this Schisme* (saith the Author) *there was no less than six Popes at once.* 1. Benedict *was expulsed.* 2. Silvester *the Third gets in, but is cast out again, and* Benedict *restored.* 3. *But being again cast out,* Gregory *the Sixth is put into his place: Who because he was ignorant of Letters, caused another Pope to be Consecrated with him, to perform Church-Offices, which was the fourth: which displeased many, and therefore a third is chosen instead of the two that were fighting with one another: But* Henry (*the Emperour*) *coming in, deposed them all, and chose* Clement *the Second,* (who was the sixth of them that were alive at once.) In my Opinion this *Gregory* the Sixth shewed himself the honestest Man of them all: Who though he could not read himself had the humility by chusing a Partner to confess his ignorance. And I am perswaded if the question had come before him, which was the truest Translation of the *Hebrew* or *Greek* Text, or such like, the Man would scarce have pretended to *Infallibility* in judging. The *nineteenth Schisme, was between* Innocent *the Second and* Peter Leonis, *and* Innocent (saith the Author) *got the better because he had more on his side.*] A good Title no doubt! and thence a good Succession.

The

The twentieth Schiſme (ſaith *Wernerus*) *was great between* Alexander *the Third and four others, and it laſted ſeventeen years.*

After Nicolas *the Fourth* (ſaith he) *there was no Pope for two years and a half* (where was the Church then?) *and* Celeſtine *the Fifth that ſucceeded him reſigning it,* Boniface *the Eighth entered, that ſtiled himſelf Lord of the whole World in Spirituals and Temporals; of whom it was ſaid, he entered as a Fox, lived as a Lyon, and dyed like a Dog.* I have as good hope of the ſalvation of *Celeſtine* the Fifth and *Felix* the Fifth as any two of them, becauſe as they were drawn in as ſimple Men in ignorance, ſo their reſignation ſhewed ſome hope that they repented.

The 22. *Schiſme* (ſaith *Wernerus ad an.* 1373.) *was the worſt and moſt ſubtil Schiſme of all that were before it: for it was ſo perplexed that the moſt Learned and Conſcientious Men were not able to find out to whom they ſhould adhere: And it was continued for forty years to the great ſcandal of the whole Clergie, and the great loſs of ſouls, becauſe of Hereſies and other evils that then ſprung up, becauſe there was no diſcipline in the Church againſt them. And therefore from this* Urban *the Sixth to the time of* Martin *the Fifth, I know not who was Pope.*] (Nor I neither: nor any one elſe I think).

The twenty third Schiſme, was between *Felix* the Fifth and *Eugenius* the Fourth, of which ſaith *Wernerus* [*Hence aroſe great contention among the Writers of this Matter,* pro & contra, *and they cannot agree to this day:* For one part ſaith *that a Council is above the Pope; the other part on the contrary ſaith, no, but the Pope is above the Council: God grant his Church Peace, &c.*] The Chriſtian World being all in Diviſions becauſe of ſidings for theſe ſeveral Popes, the Emperours were conſtrained to call

call General Councils to end the Schismes: That at *Constance* thought they had done the Work; but they left Work enough for that at *Basil*, and more than they could do: When they found not a fit Man among the Clergy, they chose a Lay-man to be Pope, the Duke of *Savoy*, a Man noted for honest Simplicity and Piety, and called him *Felix* the Fifth: But *Eugenius*, who was cast out by the Council for his wickedness, kept the place, and made the Duke glad to resign and leave the Popedome.

Should I stay to tell you after the Barbarous Age 900. what work the Popes made in the World, how many thousand they forced to death upon the Wars at *Jerusalem*; how many score thousand *Waldenses* and *Albigenses* they Murdered; How they forced Kings to kiss their Feet, and trod on the Neck of *Frederick* the Emperour: How they divided the Empire by a Rebellious War against the Emperours *Henry* the Third and Fourth; And how they Armed their Subjects and Neighbours against them, yea the Emperours Son against his own Father; And how the Writers of those times are divided, and open the lamentable Divisions of the Ages in which they lived; What work they made here against the Kings of *England*; and what passed between *Boniface* the Eighth and the King of *France*, and the Coin on which he Stamped his Resolution to *destroy* Babylon, *&c.* you would little think that either *Holiness* or *Unity* were any Property of the *Roman* Church.

Qu. *But if most did not favour them, how did they ascend to so great power?* *Ans.* 1. The old Name of the *Imperial Rome*, and the *Popes Primacie* in the *Empire*, kept up a Veneration for him in the ignorant. 2. The Eastern Emperours seated at *Constantinople* were so taken up with Wars, Rebellions, and other Difficulties

at

at home, that they could not take ſufficient care of the Weſt; but left the Popes too much advantage to grow great: and wickedneſs alſo increaſing among them (though the Princes preſence kept *their Patriarchs* in more order and ſubmiſſion, than the Popes that were become maſterleſs) provoked God to give them up to be conquered by the *Mahometan Turks*: And by the Ambition of the Popes, the Emperours wanted the due aſſiſtance of their Weſtern Subjects, to reſiſt their Enemies. And the Pope took the advantage of the Eaſtern Emperours weakneſs, to lead the Weſt into a ſettled Rebellion, offering the King of *France* the Weſtern Empire, which he embraced, the Pope making his Bargain with him for his own advantage. 3. And in the Wars of Chriſtian Princes, the Pope uſed to obtrude his Arbitration, in ſuch a manner as tended to his gain: ſo that he ſhortly got to be a temporal Prince of a great part of *Italy*, and to have Crowns and Kingdoms made feudatary to him. 4. And he got *Germany* to be broken into ſo many ſmall Republicks and Liberties, as that they were not able to unite to reſiſt him. 5. And he took great advantage of the religious humours of any that were devout, and allowed them ſo many and various Societies, and with ſo great Priviledges, as obliged them generally to uphold and ſerve him: Though he cruelly perſecuted all that were againſt his Power and Intereſt, yet he allowed almoſt all the Diverſities of ſuch as would but unite in him and ſerve him. 6. And as he ſo twiſted his own and all his Clergies Intereſt, that they were all ready to obey and defend him againſt their ſeveral Princes, and thereby had a great power in every Chriſtian State in *Europe*, ſo, keeping all his Clergie unmarryed, their wealth ſtill accumulated and flowed into the Church: And the Eaſtern Empire being

firſt

firſt weakned and then overthrown, and the Weſtern Nations kept weak, and in continual Wars againſt each other, there was none well able to reſiſt his Pride, but one party ſtill was ready to flatter him, partly to keep their own Clergy in Peace, and partly to have his help againſt their Enemies.

And the grand Cheat by which they were commonly deceived was, that they lookt more at his preſent poſſeſſion of Primacie, than at the reaſon and right by which he claimed it; and ſo he that had been Prime Patriarch in one Empire, ſet up by the Prince, ſtill claimed the right of the ſame places when the Empire was diſſolved: as if the Subjects of the Kings of *France*, *Spain*, &c. muſt obey him, becauſe they did ſo when they were the Subjects of *Conſtantine*, *Theodoſius*, *Valentinian*, &c. For by little and little he changed his Title mentioned in the Council of *Calcedon*, into a pretended *Divine Right*, and ſo they that would not have obeyed him as ſet up by *Cæſar* and his Councils, obeyed him as if he had been ſet up by God: For the name of St. *Peter and his Chair and Succeſſour* was uſed as the common blind.

And next to that he did by degrees change his claim of a *Primacie in the Empire* into a claim of Primacie in *all the World*: and his claim of a meer *Primacie*, into a claim of *Soveraignty*, or *Governing Monarchy*.

If you ask me, how could he blind Men ſo far as to make ſuch a change? You ſeem not to know Man-kind, nor to obſerve common experience. Do you not conſider what power the Clergie had every where got with the People? What an advantage poſſeſſion and St. *Peters* name were? And how lamentably ignorant they kept the People? Do we not ſee that even in our more knowing times, yea among Proteſtants, yea with ſome

Divines, the evident distinction between their *Humane Right* and their pretended *Divine Right*, and between an *Universal Council or Church of the Empire*, and of the *whole World*, have not been sufficiently observed in our Disputes against them?

And the additional Countries of voluntary Subjects in *Brittain*, *Hungary*, *Sweden*, *Denmark*, &c. which of later times, since his Imperial *Primacie*, have fallen in to him, have much helped to blind the people herein, and to serve his Claim as by Divine Right. For which ends his Emissaries have taken great pains, at the East and West *Indies*, in *China*, and *Japan* and *Congo*, (and once they made an attempt in *Abassia*,) and among the *Greeks* and in many other Nations of the World; laudably seeking to win some Heathens to Christ, that they might win them to the Pope; and turbulently seeking to disturb the *Greeks* and other Christian Churches, to draw them to the obedience of the Pope.

The Doctrines by which they promote their design are more than I may now stay to open.

I. One of the chief is, by depressing the Honour of the sacred Scriptures, as insufficient to acquaint us with all Gods will that is necessary to our salvation, without *supplemental Tradition*; that so all men might be brought to depend on them as the Keepers of Tradition.

But 1. Is their Tradition yet written in any of their *own Books*, or not? If not, where are they kept? And who knoweth what they are? Is it not strange that so many Doctors in so many Ages, all remembring them, would none of them ever write them down? Are they in the Memory of the Pope only? (What of those that could not read, or that were condemned as Hereticks or Infidels?) Then all the World must receive them from the

the Popes Memory. If so, must it be *word or writing*? And had he no Memory of them before he was Pope? But if it be in *other Mens* Memories that your unwritten Traditions are kept, in whose is it? If in all the Doctors of your Church, why did not *Luther*, *Melanthon*, *Pet. Martyr* and the rest that turned from you, know them? Or did they suddenly *forget* them all when they turned Protestants? And how vast must your necessary Religion be, if yet it must have more in it unwritten, than is to be found in all your great Volumes of Councils, and your huge Library?

But I suppose you will say that all your unwritten Traditions are *now written*: If so, they are not *unwritten*: And *how long* have they been written, and by whom? If Fathers and Sons could keep them unwritten in memory a thousand years, why not 1100, and why not 1660? *&c.* If they were written in the beginning, where be the Books? Are they not such as other Christians can read and understand as well as you, (or an illiterate Pope?) If there be a necessity of having them in writing now, was there not the same necessity to former Ages?

2. I suppose you will send us to your *Councils* for those *Traditions*: But if the Bishops know them not before they come to the Council, how do they begin to know them then? Do they go thither for a new miraculous Revelation of an old Tradition left with the whole Church?

1. But do not Councils oft determine things confessedly uncertain to the Church before; and yet out of utter uncertainty, it suddenly becometh an Article of Faith? For Instance, the great Council at *Basil* saith (*Bin. sess.* 36. *p.* 80.) ["A hard Question hath been in divers parts

" and before this Synod, about the Conception of the " glorious Virgin *Mary*, and the beginning of her Sancti- " fication: Some saying that the Virgin and her Soul was " for some time, or instant of time, actually under Origi- " nal Sin: Others on the contrary saying, that from the " beginning of her Creation God loving her gave her " Grace, by which preserving and freeing that blessed " Person from the Original Spot-----We having diligently " lookt into the Authorities and Reasons which for many " years past have in publick relation on both sides been " alledged, before this holy Synod, and having seen ma- " ny other things about it, and weighed them by ma- " ture consideration, do *Define* and *Declare*, That the Do- " ctrine affirming That the glorious Virgin *Mary* the Mo- " ther of God, by the singular preventing and opera- " ting Grace of God, was never actually under Original " Sin, but was ever free from all Original and actual Sin, " and was holy and immaculate, is to be approved, held " and embraced of all Catholicks as godly and conso- " nant to Church-worship, Catholick Faith, right Rea- " son, and sacred Scripture: and that henceforth it shall " be lawful for no Man to Preach or Teach the con- " trary.

Where was this Tradition kept before, that was so hard a Controversie till now?

2. And do not General Councils bring in Novelties? I cited formerly the words of *Cajetan* in his Oration in the Council at the *Laterane* under *Leo* 10. charging the Council of *Constance*, *Basil* and *Pisa* with Novelty, and such Novelty as would have quite defaced the Church and was inconsistent with it. And *Pighius* charg- eth them with the like. Yea I told you before where he saith that General Councils themselves are a Novelty de- vised by *Constantine*.

3. Be

3. Be not General Councils themselves approved or reprobated at the pleasure of the Pope? What a number of reprobated Councils were there? that yet were as numerous as the approved, and as lawfuly called and assembled. *Bellarmine* instanceth in the 2. of *Ephesus*, *Constance*, *Basil*, and many more: Of which more before.

II. Another of their deceits is by pretending to *Vinc. Lerinensis* Rule, *quod ab omnibus*, *ubique*, *semper*, &c. as if *Antiquity* and *Universality* were on their side. I must remember that I have long ago confuted these and the rest of their deceits in my *Key for Catholicks*: Yet I will briefly speak here to these two.

1. For *Antiquity* we willingly stand to it, and to the rejecting of all Novelty in Religion: But we must have better proof than the word of our Grand-fathers, or a Priest. 1. Is any of their Books or Traditions elder than the holy Scripture? 2. Either the *Greeks*, *Armenians*, *Abassines*, *&c.* have been sure Keepers of *Antiquity*, or not: If yea, then we may take their Testimony as well as the Church of *Romes*. If not, why may not you prove as ill Keepers of it as they?

3. But are they not *certain Novelties* that you would impose on us under the colour of *Antiquity*? Read but *Pet. Moulin de Novit. Papismi*, or Mr. *Th. Doelittles* Discourse in the *Morning Lectures* against Popery, and you shall see the Novelty of your Religion fully proved. Take now but these few instances. 1. Your very *Patriarchate*, *Primacie*, Claim of Universality, General Councils, are all proved Novelties before.

2. Your own Writers confess that the denying the People *Christs Blood* (or the Cup) in the Lords Supper is a Novelty, that prevailed by Custom by little and little,

and

and was not common long before the Council at *Constance*: Dare you say that it was so from the beginning, or of old?

3. Can you possibly believe that your forbidding men to read the Scriptures in a known Tongue without a Licence is not a Novelty, if ever you read *Chrysostom*, *Augustine*, *Jerome*, or any thing of the Ancients?

4. Is it not a Novelty for the publick Prayers of the Church to be ordinarily made in a Tongue not understood by the generality of the People? But I must stop.

2. And as to *Universality* I have before proved, 1. That by their own Confession most of the Churches and Bishops of the World have been against them. 2. That at this day they are not above the third part of Christians. Too small an Universal Church for any man of Charity and Consideration to be a member of: A Sect that call themselves *All the Church*. *Jacob. a Vitr. Histor. Orient. Cap.* 77. tells us that, *the Churches in the Easterly part of* Asia *alone exceeded in multitude both the Greek and Latine Churches.*

As for their telling us that all these followed *Dioscorus* a Heretick, or were *Nestorians*, and that all the *Abassines*, *Armenians*, *Georgians*, *Syrians*, *Coptics*, *Greeks*, *Protestants*, *&c.* are Hereticks, or Schismaticks, I have answered it so oft at large that I must not repeat what I have said. Only, 1. I say that if the Censures and Revilings of Adversaries can un-christen all others, and appropriate the Church to them that have least Charity, perhaps the Quakers may shortly have as fair a Title as the Papists. If *General Councils* be not to be believed when they Hereticate Popes, I will not believe a Railer when he Hereticates most of the Christian World, whom he never saw or spake with? Sure that man judgeth persons unheard.

unheard. 2. I repeat the words of *Burchardus* one of your own, that long lived among them, and ſpake what he ſaw, *p.* 325, 326. [*And as for thoſe that we judge to be damned Hereticks, as the* Neſtorians, Jacobites, Maronites, Georgians, *and the like, I found them to be for the moſt part good and ſimple men, and living ſincerely towards God and Men, they are of great abſtinence, &c.*----And p. 324. he ſaith, that [*the* Syrians, Greeks, Armenians, Georgians, Neſtorians, Nubians, Jubeans, Chaldeans, Maronites, Ethiopians, Egyptians, *and many other Nations of Chriſtians there inhabit; and that ſome are Schiſmaticks not ſubject to the Pope, and others called Hereticks, as the* Neſtorians, Jacobites, *&c. but there are many in theſe Sects that are very ſimple, knowing nothing of Hereſies; devoted to Chriſt, macerating the Fleſh with Faſtings, and clothed with the moſt ſimple Garments, ſo that they far excel the very* RELIGIOUS *of the Church of* Rome.] And, *p.* 323. of the Papiſts, whom he calleth by the Name of Chriſtians, as if it were proper to them, he ſaith, [*There are in the Land of Promiſe men of every Nation under Heaven, and every Nation liveth after their own Rites; and to ſpeak the very truth to our own great confuſion, there are none found in it that are worſe and more corrupt in Manners than Chriſtians,*] (that is, Papiſts.)

3. If greater Errours and Vices than are among the *Armenians*, the *Abaſſines*, *Syrians*, *&c.* will allow us to reject men from our Communion, how much more cauſe have we to renounce Communion with Popes and Papiſts than with theſe Churches?

4. How can any man ſay that Nations and Countries are to be rejected as Hereticks, unleſs the ſingle perſons guilty were tryed and heard? when there is no Hereſie but

but what is in individuals, and no Law of God or Reason condemneth the innocent for the guilties faults; much less all Posterity for their Ancestors.

III. But they never gain more than by aggravating the Divisions that are among other Christians, and boasting of the Unity of their Church: And the Contentions that have been among us have given them such advantage, as that some in the sense of their former guilt, having been Sect-masters themselves, have turned Papists, as thinking it the state of Union; and having found no settlement in those ways which they have tryed, because they never rightly understood the true temperament of the Christian Religion which they professed, they think to find it in that way that they never tryed; as sick men turn from side to side for ease, while the cause of their weariness and pain is within them, and turneth with them.

Here let the Reader note, 1. That Fools judge of Differences in Religion by the *noise* that it makes in the World; but men of Reason judge of it by the *greatness* and *number* of the points of Difference. Verily our Differences here in *England*, and the Neighbour Protestant Churches, have shewed in us much personal peevishness, unskilfulness, and other faults; but in my judgment they are such as greatly commend our *real concord* in the same Religion, and partly our *Conscience* in valuing it, and being loth to lose it.

If you see Latine Grammarians reviling one another, about the *spelling* or *pronunciation* of a word or two, and critically contending with *Varro*, *Gellius*, &c. which is the right, when a man that never knew a word of Latine but Welch or Irish, never strove about such Questions in his life; which of these will you think have more agreement

agreement in their Language? I would say that those men that disagree but about the pronunciation of a few words are very much agreed, in comparison of a Barbarian, that agreeth not with them in a Sentence or a Word. Even the old Schoolmen were in Language more agreed with *Erasmus*, *Faber*, *Hutten*, and other Critical Grammarians that derided them, than any illiterate man was with any of them. All *Gruterus* his Volumes of Grammatical Controversies, shew not so much distance in Language, as the peaceable silence of an unlearned man doth.

And no one strives much about that which he doth not much care for: Countrymen can contemptuously laugh at Logical Disputes or Criticisms. Horses or Oxen will not strive with us for our Gold or Jewels, Clothes or Food, as we do with one another; and yet they are not so like us in the *estimation* of such things, as we are to one another.

When I hear religious persons contentiously censuring each other, about some little points of Ceremony, Order, Discipline, or Form, which are but the *fimbriæ*, or the Welts and Laces of Religion, I am angry at their weakness and defect of love; but I must needs think that there is very great concord in the *Faith* and *Religion* (Objective) of these men, who differ about no greater matters than such as these. If men that were building a Palace would fall together by the Ears, only about the driving of a Pin, I should marvel at their concord that differed in no more; though I could wish them, like wrangling Children, whipt for their folly and frowardness till they were quiet. The *great* things that *Protestants* have paltrily wrangled about, are, 1. The Doctrinal Controversies called *Arminian*: 2. And the mat-

ters of Diſcipline. and Ceremonies. The former I have ſhewed lately in a large Volume, hath much more of *verbal* than of *real difference*, and is cheriſhed by the ambiguity of words, aud the unskilfulneſs of too many to diſcuſs thoſe ambiguities, and find out exactly the true ſtate of the Controverſie: It is oft but Stubble that maketh the greateſt blaze.

And as for the other, I would not undervalue the leaſt things of Religion, but I will ſay, that *Engagement*, *Faction* and *worldly Intereſt* are magnifying Glaſſes to many men, and make a Mote to ſeem a Beam, and a Gnat to ſeem a Camel. And it is one of the Devils old Wiles, to keep men from learning of Chriſt, how to Worſhip the Father of Spirits, in ſpirit and truth, by ſtarting ſuch Queſtions, as, *whether in this Mountain or at Jeruſalem men ought to worſhip?* and to hinder *godly edifying by doting about queſtions that gender ſtrife.* And fighting for Shoo-buckles may ſhew the quarrelſomneſs of men, but it proveth not the Greatneſs of the matter.

2. Note further that though *Subjective Religion* (the *meaſures* of our belief, Love and Obedience) be as various as perſons are; yet the *Objective Religion of all true Proteſtants* is the ſame: Not only the ſame in the Eſſentials (*one God, one Saviour and Lord, one Baptiſmal Covenant, one Creed, one Spirit, one Body of Chriſt, and one Hope of Glory, Eph.* 4. 4, 5, 6.) but alſo the ſame in all the *Integral parts*: For it is *Integrally* the *Holy Scripture* which containeth all that they take (with the Law of Nature) to be the whole Law of God, and ſo the Rule of Divine *Faith*, *Deſire* and *Duty*. They may *ſubjectively* have ſome difference in underſtanding ſome Texts, (as the moſt Learned and holy in the world have:)

But

But *Objectively* they have no other Divine Faith or Religion.

3. And note, that the Church that *Proteſtants*, yea *Greeks*, *Armenians*, *Syrians*, *Abaſſines* are of, are all certainly one and the ſame Church: For a Church is conſtituted of the *Ruling* and the *Ruled* Parts. And they perfectly agree that *Chriſt* is the only Eſſentiating and Univerſal Head; In him they all unite, and confeſs that there is no other. Even the Patriarch of *Conſtantinople*, as I have ſhewed, claimeth but a Primacie in the Empire, and not the Government of all the World, no not of us in *England*.

And as for the Ruled Conſtitutive part, we are agreed that it is All *Baptized Chriſtians* that have not apoſtatized, nor forſaken any Eſſential part of Chriſtianity, nor are excommunicate by Power from Chriſt. So that we are clearly all of one and the ſame Church.

But how far the Papiſts differ in the *Greatneſs* and *number* of their Controverſies, I think to tell you a little more anon.

IV. I may not ſtay to ſhew at large, how they vary their ſhape and courſe as may fit their Intereſt: How ſometime they put on the perſon of Infidels or Atheiſts to plead men into an uncertainty of all Religion, that they may be looſe enough to follow them into theirs: For even ſo *Car. Boverius* would have perſwaded our late King, *Apparat. ad Conſult.* [*The firſt thing is* (ſaith he) *ſeeing true Religion is to be inquired after by you, that before you addreſs your ſelf to ſearch for it, you firſt have all Religions in ſuſpicion with you; and that you will ſo long ſuſpend* (or take off) *your mind and will from the Faith and Religion of the Proteſtants, as you are in ſearching after the truth.*]

Reader, doth not this tell you whence much of our late Atheism and Infidelity cometh, and what it tendeth to? I tell thee not the words of a Novice, but a person chosen to have seduced our King, when he was Prince, in *Spain*. And is not this way very suitable to the end? How must men become Papists? *Boverius* will teach you: First "*suspect* all Religion, and with your very *Mind* and *Will* "cease to believe that there is a God, or that he is Pow- "erfull, Wise or Good, or that we are his Creatures and "Subjects, or that there is any Heaven or Hell or Life to "come, or that Christ is not a Deceiver but a Saviour, "or that any of the Bible is true: Cease from Loving, "Fearing, Obeying or trusting God, and from loving "man for his sake: Cease praying to him, and forbear- "ing any wickedness, injustice, cruelty, perjury or fil- "thiness as being forbidden by him, and this as long as "you are searching after the truth.] Verily this devil- ish counsel is so notoriously followed now by some, that we may fear what truth it is that they are search- ing after. Certainly this way is of the Devil, and how it can lead to God I know not. I love *Cartesian* Philo- sophy the worse because its principle is so congruous to this.

And their Doctrine of lawful hiding their Religion by Equivocation is commonly known. And what they say about coming to our Churches I have formerly cited at large out of *Thom. a Jesu*, and the lawfulness of denying the person of a Clergie-man or a Religious man: And the ground of all, [*because humane Laws for the most part bind not the Subjects Conscience when there is great hazard of life, as Azorius* hath well taught, *Inst. Moral.* To. 1. l. 8. c. 27. See the Authors words *de Conver. Gent.* li. 5. Dub. 4. pag. 218. and Dub. 5. p. 218, 219. and Dub. 6. p. 220.

We

We may find them in our Churches and garb when their intereſt requires it. But again I muſt for all theſe points refer the Reader to *my foremention'd Book* (*A Key for Catholicks.*)

The hiſtory of the Papacie being thus briefly given you, I ſhould next briefly tell you, I. What a Pope is; II. What a Papiſt is; III. What the preſent Papal Church is: But it requireth more than this ſhort Writing, to open any one of theſe to the full: But take this breviate.

CHAP. VI.

What the Pope is.

I. WE are not to deſcribe the Biſhop of *Rome* as he was at the beginning, but as in that Stature to which he is ſince grown up. And ſo unmeaſurable a Potentate muſt be deſcribed to you but *by parts, and inadequate Conceptions*; And I will no more undertake to enumerate all, than to Name all the Kingdoms known and unknown to us *Europeans* which he claimeth the Government of. But I remember who it was that ſhewed Chriſt all the Kingdoms of the world, and ſaid, *All theſe things will I give thee if thou wilt fall down and worſhip me*, *Math.* 4. 9. Or as *Luk.* 4. 6. *All this Power will I give thee and the Glory of them, for that is delivered to me, and to whomſoever I will I give it.*

I. *The Pope of* Rome *is an Uſurper, who from the lawful Epiſcopacy of one particular Church aſpired to be a Biſhop over many Churches and Biſhops, and a Metropolitan, and thence to be a Patriarch,* and the *firſt Patriarch*

in

in the Roman *Empire in order of Dignity, and entred a Conteſt for the Primacie with his Competitor of* Conſtantinople, *which is not ended to this day; And next claimed an Univerſal Government in the Empire as well as a Primacy; And alſo the Government of ſuch Neighbour Churches as had once been in the Empire, or had been lately converted by any of his Clergie; And laſtly being made a King of* Rome *or Secular Prince in* Italy, *he alſo claimed a Monarchy or Government over all the world under the name of Eccleſiaſtical.*]

All this is proved in the foregoing Hiſtory of the Papacy, and may better be found out by any that will peruſe the Hiſtory of the Church and Empire, than by particular Citations.

II. *By the name of Eccleſiaſtical power he underſtandeth not only that which is truly ſpiritual or ſacerdotal, by which Gods word is preached and applyed to particular perſons, by reception into Chriſtian Communion, and excluſion from it, ſententially; But alſo a power of erecting Courts of Judicature in all Kingdoms to judge of caſes about Miniſters, Temples, Tythes, Teſtaments, Adminiſtration of Goods, Lawfulneſs of Marriages, Divorces and many ſuch like, in a manner of Conſtraint which is proper to the Magiſtrate:* Abuſively calling *this the Eccleſiaſtical Power* in foro exteriore, *diſtinct from the ſacerdotal* in foro interiore, *cheating the world with words.*

Experience fully proveth this.

III. *For the performance of this Deceit they appropriate to Princes and other Magiſtrates the Titles of* [CIVIL] or [SECULAR] *making the world believe that as Soul and Body differ, ſo the Pope and his Clergie being Governours of the Soul, or in order to ſalvation, excel Kings and Magiſtrates who are but Governours for bodily welfare and Civil Peace.*

Whereas

Whereas indeed the difference of the Offices of *Christian Magistrates* and *Pastors*, is not, that one is but for the *Body* and the other for the *Soul*; for both are to further mens Salvation, and true Religion, and the obedience of Gods Laws in order thereto: But it is in this, that Princes and Magistrates have the Power of Governing men in things Secular and Religious within their true Cognisance *by the Sword*, that is, by *external Compulsion and Coercion*, by *Mulcts and Penalties* forcibly executed; whereas the Pastors have only the Charge of Teaching men *Christs Doctrine*, and Guiding the Church in the administration of Gods Worship, and by the *Keys or Authority* from Christ, judging who is capable or uncapable of Church Communion, and declaring pardon and Salvation to the penitent for their Comfort, and the contrary to the impenitent for their humiliation; and all this only *by Word of Mouth, without any Constraining force.*

Proof of the Character.

Pope *Innoc.* 3. (*vid. &* Cosins *Hist. Transub.* p. 147, 148) [" *God made two great Lights in the Firmament of* " *Heaven,—and of the Universal Church; that is, he in-* " *stituted two Dignities, which are the Pontifical Autho-* " *rity and the Regal Power: But that which ruleth the* " *Day, that is, things spiritual, is the greatest, and that* " *which ruleth carnal things is the less: that it may be* " *known that the difference between Popes and Kings* " *is such as is the difference between the Sun and the* " *Moon.*

If this were true, the lowest Priest were incomparably more honourable or amiable than Kings, as the Soul is more excellent than the Body: But *David, Solomon, Hezekiah, Josiah*, and all good Kings, did shew that

that Religion was the matter of their Government and the principal part of their care. Read for this fully Bishop *Bilson* of Christian obedience, Bishop *Buckeridge* for the Magistrates Power, and Bishop *Andrews Tortura Torti*; excellent discourses against the Papal Usurpation.

IV. *The Office which he thus claimeth as over all the Earth, is to be the Vicar of Christ or of God, or the Vice-Christ or Vice-God, as Kings have their Vice-Kings in remote Provinces.*

Proved.

I have elsewhere cited the words of Popes saying, that they are *Vice-Christi* and *Vice-Dei*, at large: And Pope *Julius*'s words [*we holding the place of the Great God, the Maker of all things and all Laws:*] And *Carol. Boverius*'s words, *Consult. de. Rat. fidei*, &c. to our late King, saying [*Besides Christ the Invisible Head of the Church, there is a necessity, that we acknowledge another certain visible Head, subrogate to Christ and instituted of him*, &c.] And *Card. Betrand's* words in *Biblioth. Patrum*, that saith, *Almighty God had not been wise else, if he had not sent One only to Govern the world under him:*] *And Boverius* reason [*Christ was himself on Earth once a visible Monarch; And if the Church had need of a visible Monarch, it hath need of one still.*] Christ said that it was necessary that he went away that the Paraclete might come, whom *Tertullian* calleth his *Agent*; But the Papists will not part with him so, but they will have his *Body* here still, and yet a Vice-Christ or visible Monarch also in his stead: See their own words, which I have cited at large in my Answer to Mr. *Johnson*.

V. *The pretended ground of this his Claim is, that St.* Peter

Peter *received this power from Christ, and that St.* Peter *was Bishop last at* Rome, *and that the Pope succeedeth him in his Bishoprick, and Power.*

This is professed commonly by them.

But 1. It is false that St. *Peter* received any such Power from Christ, as to be the Governour of all the rest of the Apostles and Christians in the World: He never exercised or claimed such a Government, but in cases of Controversie *Act.* 15. and *Gal.* 2, &c. He dealeth but on equal terms with the rest. And they that said *I am of Cephas*, are as well rebuked as they that said, *I am of Paul.*] And 1 *Cor.* 12. 28, 29, &c. Apostles are said to be but *chief Members* of the Church, and *Christ* the only *Head*: And when the Disciples strove who should be the greatest, Christ giveth it not to *Peter*, but forbideth it to them all: And *Peter* himself as a fellow Elder exhorteth all Elders to oversee and feed the Flock, *not as Lords over the Heritage*, &c. and never claimeth a Soveraignty to himself. No word mentioneth any Power that St. *Peter* had greater than his Apostleship: And *Bellarmine* professeth that the Pope hath not his power as succeeding him in his Apostleship, but as an ordinary Pastor over the whole Church.

2. There is no certainty that ever *Peter* was at *Rome* (as *Nilus* hath shewed;) but a humane Testimony of many later Fathers, upon the words of uncertain Reporters before them, which are to be believed indeed as probable but no more; There being as great a number of Papist Writers I think (about 60) that tell us there was a Pope *Joane*, and yet it is uncertain if not least probable. But if he was at *Rome*, Apostles were no where proper Bishops. Bishops were the fixed Elders or Pastors of particular Churches: Apostles were moveable and Itine-

rant, having an Indefinite Commiſſion to go preach the Goſpel to all the world as far as they were able. Though the ancient Fathers uſed to call them Biſhops becauſe *pro tempore* they Ruled (perſwaſively) where they came: Though indeed their work was to ſettle Churches and Biſhops, and not to be ſettled Biſhops themſelves.

3. *Paul* was certainly and long at *Rome*, and liker to be as a Biſhop there of the two: If *Paul* was not one, *Peter* was not; for there is no more, but leſs proof of his Government there. If *Paul* was one, then one City had two, contrary to the old Canons.

4. There is no proof that *Peter's* being *laſt at Rome* gave his Power to all or any following Biſhops of *Rome*, any more than to the Biſhops of *Antioch* who are ſaid to ſucceed him in his firſt Biſhoprick; or any more than Chriſts dying at *Jeruſalem*, the Mother Church, did fix the Supremacie there: or any more than the other eleven Apoſtles did leave their power which they had above all ordinary Biſhops, to the places where they abode (either laſt or firſt.) If *Peter's* dying Biſhop at *Rome* prove ſuch a ſucceſſion of Univerſal Monarchy, the aforeſaid Succeſſions will be proved by the ſame Reaſon, which yet none affirm: Even *Alexandria* claimed but from St. *Mark* who was leſs than thirteen Apoſtles: But no *Teſtament* of *Peter* declaring any conveyance of ſuch a Monarchy is pretended by the Popes (which is a wonder:) Nor any word that ever he uſed of ſuch importance.

5. I have ſhewed that General Councils (*Calced.* and *Conſtant.*) have declared that *Romes* primacy had a later humane riſe.

Yet would they have exerciſed no other Government than St. *Peter* did, the world would not have been troubled by them as they have been.

VI. *The*

VI. *The Papists seem not resolved themselves whether the Pope have an Universal Apostleship or Teaching office, as well as the Universal Monarchy or Government.*

Though *Bellarmine* say that he succeedeth not *Peter* as an *Apostle*, but as a *Pastor*; yet most others that I have seen medling with it, say otherwise. If he succeed not in the Apostleship, he is no true Successour of St. *Peter* at all, in any superemience of Power: For what he had was as an Apostle: If he do, then he is bound to go preach himself to the Nations of the world as *Peter* was: To send others to preach, and not do it himself was no *Apostleship*: They were sent themselves. *David* and *Solomon* set up Priests, and yet were themselves no Priests: *Hezekiah* and *Josiah* sent and set up Preachers, and yet undertook not that office themselves.

VII. *This Pope claimeth the sole Power of calling General Councils of all the Christian world (yet never did it) And consequently of being the Judge when any shall be called, and so whether ever there shall be any or not. And though former General Councils voted that they should be every ten years, yet he prevaileth to the contrary.*

VIII. *Also he claimeth the sole power of presiding in such Councils, and also of making their Decrees either valid by his approbation or null or invalid by his Reprobation, as he please: so that nothing that they Decree is of force but as it pleaseth him; whence we have distinct Catalogues of Approved and Reprobate Councils.*

Yet no mortal man knoweth oftentimes how much of a Councils Acts and Decrees the Pope approveth. When *Martin* the fifth had consented to all done by the Council of *Constance*, the word [*Conciliariter acta*] seemed to the Council to mean [*all that they did de facto as a*

Council.] But the Popes ever since yet reject that Council on pretense that by [*conciliariter*] was meant *all that* de jure *as a Council they might do.* *Gregory* the first approved of the four first General Councils, receiving them as the four Gospels (and if his Predecessors did not, it was because their consent was not taken to be necessary, nor much sought.) And yet now *Bellarmine* raileth at the Council of *Calcedon*, and they tell us how much of it they receive and how much not. And so of many others.

And nothing is more evident in such History, than that the Emperors and not the Pope, were they that called divers of the first Councils.

IX. *The Pope accordingly claimeth a supremacy above General Councils; that he may dissolve them; but they cannot question or depose him; though General Councils have decreed the contrary.*

I recited *Binnius* words before, *Vol. 2. p. 515. Pighius*, *Gretser*'s, *Bellarmine*'s, and multitudes more might soon be produced to the same sense; The eighth General Council at *Constantinople* saith, *Can.* 21. that ["None "must compose any Accusations against the Pope] Vid. "*Bellarm. de concil. li.* 2. c. 11.

Saith *Pighius*, Hier. Eccl. li. 6. ["The Councils of *Con-* "*stance* and *Basil* went about by a new trick and pernicious "example to destroy the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy, and in- "stead of it to bring in the domination of a promiscuous "confused popular multitude; that is, to raise again *Ba-* "*bylon* it self; subjecting to themselves, or the Commu- "nity of the Church (which they falsly pretended that they "represented) the very Head and Prince of the whole "Church: and him that is the Vicar of Christ himself in "this his Kingdom; and this against Order and Nature,

"against

"againſt the cleareſt light of Goſpel Verity, againſt all "Authority of Antiquity, and againſt the undoubted faith "and judgment of the Orthodox Church it ſelf.] (And yet our Papiſts would perſwade us that their Grandfathers, much leſs great General Councils cannot bring in Novelties on pretenſe of Antiquity, and miſlead them.) Truly ſaid *Lud. Vives, in Auguſt. de Civ. Dei* l. 20. c. 26 ["Thoſe "are taken by them for Edicts and Councils which make "for them; the reſt they no more regard than a meet"ing of Women in a Work-houſe or a Waſhing-place.]

X. *He claimeth a power of Legiſlation to all the Chriſtian World, Kings, and States, and ſingle Subjects; and that no Kings can nullifie his Laws to their own Subjects: As alſo the power of receiving Accuſations and Appeals, and of judging and executing accordingly.*

This needeth no proof, being not denyed.

XI. *He claimeth power to Interdict whole Kingdoms; that is, when they think the Rulers give them Cauſe; to forbid the preaching of the Goſpel and publick Worſhip of God, to all the People of the Land; yea forbidding the Clergie who are Subjects to obey their own Princes who ſhall command them (as the Kings of* Iſrael *did the Prieſts and Levites) to do their offices.*

That is, If the State or King offend them, they will be avenged on God by denying him all Publick Worſhip, and on the ſouls of millions of innocent people by doing their worſt to ſend them to Hell, (where the unbelieving ignorant, and thoſe that worſhip not God, muſt go.) The inſtances in *Germany*, and the *Venetian* Interdict and others are too full proof of their Claim and Practice.

XII. *The Pope claimeth power, even by the Decrees of an approved*

approved General Council to oblige all men to believe that all theirs and all other mens ſenſes and perception upon ſenſe, are certainly deceived, when they think that there is real Bread and Wine after Conſecration: And this denyal of all mens Common ſenſe, he hath made an Article of faith, and neceſſary to ſalvation.

XIII. *He hath by the ſame Council decreed that all thoſe that do not thus far renounce all their ſenſes, ſhall be exterminated and made uncapable to make any will,* &c. *And by other of his Laws, that they be all burnt as Hereticks; and delivered to that end to the ſecular power.*

XIV. *By the ſame Council he hath decreed that Temporals Lords ſhall take an Oath to execute this Decree, and ſhall be excommunicated if they exterminate not all ſuch Believers of ſenſe from their dominions: And to diſhonour Kings by Excommunications (whom the fifth Commandment bids us honour) is an act of Papal power.*

XV. *By the ſame Council he hath Decreed to depoſe all temporal Lords that will not thus deſtroy or exterminate their Subjects, and to give their Dominions to Papiſts that will do it: So that the Popes power to depoſe Princes is become an Article of their Religion.*

And in his *Roman* Councils *Greg.* 7 declareth that he hath power to take down and ſet up Kings and Emperors: And in his Letters to the *German* Clergy: And what he ſaid, he did practiſe by bloody and unnatural wars, to the great diſtraction of all the Empire.

Saith *Innocent* 3. Serm. 2. [" *To me it is ſaid, I have* " *ſet thee over Nations and Kingdoms, to ſet up and de-* " *ſtroy, and ſcatter-----I am ſet up a middle perſon be-* " *tween God and Man; on this ſide God, but beyond Man;* " *yea greater than Man; who judge all, and can be judged* " *of none: I am the Bridegroom, &c.*]

XVI. *By*

XVI. *By the same Council he hath power to dispense with the Oaths of all the Subjects of such Princes, and to disoblige them, how many soever, from their Allegiance; so that the Popes Power thus to dissolve the obligation of Oaths is also become an Article of their Religion.*

I prove all these together, by giving you the words of the Council in English. Once again (though I have oft cited them) *c.* 1. they say that [" No man can be saved " out of their Universal Church.] And *c.* 2. that [" The " Bread and Wine in the Sacrament of the Altar are tran- " substantiate into the Body and Blood of Christ, the " appearances remaining.] And *c.* 3. [" We excommu- " nicate and anathematize every Heresie extolling it self " against this holy Orthodox Catholick Faith, which we " have before expounded, condemning all Hereticks by " what Names soever they be called-----And being con- " demned, let them be left to the present Secular Power, " or their Bayliffs, to be punished, the Clergy being first " degraded of their Orders. And let the Goods of such " condemned ones be confiscate, if they be Lay-men; " but if they be Clergy-men, let them be given to the " Churches whence they had their Stipends. And those " that are found to be noted *only by suspicion*, if they do " not by congruous purgation demonstrate their inno- " cency, according to the considerations of the suspicion, " and the quality of the person, let them be smitten with " the Sword of Anathema, and avoided by all men, till they " have given sufficient satisfaction; and if they remain a " year excommunicate let them be condemned as Here- " ticks: And let the *Secular Powers, in what Office soever,* " be admonished and perswaded, and if it be necessary, " *compelled* by Ecclesiastical censure, that as they would " be reputed and accounted Believers, so for the defence

" of

" of the Faith, *they take an Oath publickly*, that they will
" ſtudy in good earneſt, according to their power, to ex-
" terminate all that are by the Church denoted Hereticks,
" from the Countries ſubject to their juriſdiction. So
" that when *any one ſhall be taken into Spiritual* or *Tempo-*
" *ral Power*, he ſhall by *his Oath* make good this Chapter.
" But if the Temporal Lord, being admoniſhed by the
" Church, ſhall neglect to purge his Country of hereti-
" cal defilement, let him by the Metropolitan, and other
" com-Provincial Biſhops be tyed by the bond of Excom-
" munication. And if he refuſe to ſatisfie within a year,
" let it be ſignified to the Pope, that he may from thence-
" forth denounce his Vaſſals abſolved from his fidelity,
" and may expoſe his Country to be ſeized on by Ca-
" tholicks, who rooting out the Hereticks may poſſeſs it
" without contradiction, and may keep it in the purity
" of Faith, ſaving the Right of the Principal Lord, ſo
" be it that he himſelf do make no hindrance hereabout,
" nor oppoſe any impediment: And the ſame Law is to
" be obſerved with them that are not Principal Lords.
" And the Catholicks that, taking the Sign of the Croſs,
" ſhall ſet themſelves to the rooting out of the Hereticks,
" ſhall enjoy the ſame Indulgences and holy Priviledges
" which were granted to thoſe that go to the relief of the
" Holy Land. Moreover we decree, That the Believers,
" Receivers, Defenders, and Favourers of Hereticks ſhall
" be Excommunicate; firmly decreeing, that after any
" ſuch is noted by Excommunication, if he refuſe to ſa-
" tisfie within a year, he ſhall from thenceforth be *ipſo*
" *jure*, *infamous*, and may not be admitted to publick
" Offices or Councils or to the choice of ſuch, or to bear
" witneſs: And he ſhall be inteſtate, and not have pow-
" er to make a will, nor may come to a ſucceſſion of In-
heritance:

"heritance: And no man ſhall be forced to anſwer him in "any Cauſe but he ſhall be forced to anſwer others: And "if he be a Judge, his ſentence ſhall be invalid, and no "Cauſes ſhall be brought to his hearing: If a Notary (or "Regiſter) the inſtruments made by him ſhall be utterly "void, and damned with the damned Author: And ſo "in other like caſes we command that it be obſerved. They further command Biſhops by themſelves or their Archdeacons or other fit perſons, once or twice a year to ſearch every Pariſh where any Heretick is found to dwell, and to put all the Neighbourhood to their Oathes, whether they know of any Hereticks there, or of any *private meetings, or any that in life and manners do differ from the Common Converſation of the faithful, &c.* And the Biſhops that neglect this are to be caſt out, and others put into their places that will do them.

Here you ſee that no man muſt live on Earth (for all Kingdoms muſt be ſubject to the Pope) that will not renounce his humanity and animality or common ſenſes, and declare himſelf below a Beaſt, That all Kings are the Popes Subjects, commanded by him, and muſt take a new Oath when they are crowned to deſtroy all their Subjects that believe their ſenſes; That even the ſuſpected are undone if they prove not the Negative: That Princes muſt be a thouſand fold worſe than hang-men, who hang not whole Countries but a few condemned Maleafctors: That Popes can and muſt depoſe Kings, and Lords that will not do ſuch things as theſe, and give their Dominion to others: That the ſign of the Croſs is the Croſs Makers ſign: That all the promiſes of the pardon and happineſs that were made to the invaders of the holy Land are given to thoſe Wretches, that when they have lived in filthineſs and wickedneſs will expiate

it by murdering the innocent (as they did, say Historians, by above an hundred thousand.) This is the *Roman* way to heaven. That the very favorers of these men that will not renounce humanity are to be also utterly ruined. That (as in the *Japan* persecution of the Christians) all the neighbour-hood must be Sworn to detect them? And the office of a Bishop is to see all this done: And now if you *will see* you see how the Church of *Rome* is upheld, and propagated: And what the Religion called Popery is? And consider whether as Angels and Saints are near of Kin, or like in disposition, it be not so also with *Devils* and *wicked men*: And whether all Protestants be not Dead men in Law, or condemned, where the Papal Religion and Laws are received: And what will follow hereupon.

And besides *Gregory* the first's Declaration in his *Roman* Councils before mentioned, he saith in *Epist.* 7. l. 4. [" And for the conspiracy of Hereticks and the King, we " believe it is not unknown to you that are near them " how it may be impugned by the Catholick Bishops " and Dukes; and many others in the *German* parts: " For the faithful of the Church of *Rome* are come to " such a number, that unless the King shall come to sa- " tisfaction, they may openly profess to chuse another " King; and observing Justice, we have promised " to favour them, and will keep our promise firm, " &c.

XVII. *The Pope, though pretending to be the infallible Judge of Controversies, doth tolerate his most famous Learned Doctors, in great numbers, without any Condemnation or disowning, to write that excommunicate Kings are no Kings, and may lawfully be killed, as some say by the Popes consent or direction, or as others say, without it.*

Henry

Henry Fowlis in his Book of *Popiſh Treaſons*, hath ſo largely proved, by citing the *expreſs words* of their chief Doctors, Jeſuits, Dominicans and others, that this is their ordinary aſſertion, that I muſt remit the Reader thither for full ſatisfaction beyond all denyal.

I briefly refer you but to the words of Learned *Suarez adverſ. ſect. Angl. l. 6. Cap. 4. ſect. 14.* and *Cap. 6. ſect. 22. 24. Azorius Inſtit. Mor. part. 1. l. 8. c. 13.* And *Dom. Bannes in Thom. 22. q. 12. a. 2.* ſaith [" *when there is* " *evident knowledg of the Crime, Subjects may lawfully ex-* " *empt themſelves from the Power of their Princes, be-* " *fore any declaratory, ſentence of a Judge, ſo they have* " *but ſtrength to do it.*] [*Hence it followeth that the* " *faithful* (Papiſts) *of* England *and* Saxonie *are to be ex-* " *cuſed, that do not free themſelves from the Power of* " *their Superiours, nor make war againſt them: becauſe* " *commonly they are not ſtrong enough, to manage thoſe* " *wars: and great dangers hang over them.*

So then, the diſability of the Papiſts is all the ſecurity we can hope for from them.

Auguſtine Triumphus ſaith (*de poteſt. Eccl. q. 46. a. 2.*) " *There is no doubt but the Pope may depoſe all Kings, when* " *there is reaſonable cauſe for it.*

Part of *Suarez* words are (*Defenſ. fid. Cath. l. 6. c. 4. §. 14.*) [" *After ſentence he is altogether deprived of his* " *Kingdom, ſo that he cannot by juſt title poſſeſs it: There-* " *fore from thence-forward he may be handled as a meer* " *Tyrant, and conſequently any private man may kill him.*

I have elſewhere cited *Card. Perrons* words out of Biſhop *Uſher* profeſſing that, *if the Pope may not depoſe Kings, it will follow that he is Antichriſt who hath ſo long profeſſed it*: I grant the conſequence.

XVIII. *The Pope professeth the fallibility of General Councils, but that he is infallible himself.*

The first is proved by his reprobating many. For the second, saith *Leo* 10. *in Bull. cont. Luth. in Bin.* p. 655. [" *The holy Popes our predecessours never erred in their* " *Canons and Constitutions.*]

XIX. *They hold this gift of infallibility to be by supernatural Inspiration, beyond all natural faculties and means; even to men that cannot Read or have no Learning, at least none in the Text of Scripture, to judge of such Texts, the translation and exposition of them.*

That they pretend to be Judges in Controversies *de fide*, I need not prove: Nor that some have been Lads, and some Men unlearned, as I proved before of *Greg.* 6. Their own Histories agree in this.

XX. *Though the Decrees of General Councils be their very Religion, and pretended immutable, the Pope pretendeth to a Power to change them.* (And yet they pretend that all is old and from their forefathers.)

Both these foregoing parts are proved, by Pope *Julius* 2. in his General Council at the *Laterane* with their approbation, *Monitor. cont. Prag. Sanct. Bin.* Vol. 4. p. 560. [" *Though the Institutions of sacred Canons,* " *holy Fathers, and Popes of Rome* ---- *and their Decrees* " *be judged immutable as made by Divine Inspiration, yet* " *the Pope of* Rome, *who though of unequal merits, hold-* " *eth the place of the Eternal King, and the Maker of all* " *Things and all Laws on Earth, may abrogate these* " *Decrees when they are abused.*

XXI. *By the same pretended Power he changeth Christs own Instituted Sacrament, even in the substance of it, denying all the Laity the Cup, while they condemn all that will not believe that the wine is turned into his very Blood; And he that eateth not the Flesh of Christ, and drinketh*

drinketh not his Blood, hath not Life, (which they expound of the Sacrament.)

Christ said when he had given them the Cup, *Drink yes all of it, Mat. 26. 27.* And *Paul* delivereth it to the *Laity* from the Lord, 1 Cor. 11. 23. 25. 28. [" This do " ye, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me.] " And [as oft as ye eat this Bread, and drink this Cup, " ye shew the Lords death till he come: Let a man exa- " mine himself, and so let him eat of this Bread, and " drink of this Cup] 1 *Cor.* 10. 21. Ye cannot drink " the Cup of the Lord, and the Cup of Devils, is gi- " ven to the Laity as a reason against their Idol Commu- " nion.] In relation to the Sacrament it's said that [all " were made to drink into one Spirit.] The reception of the Spirit being likened to that drinking. And if the Pope may abrogate one half the Sacrament, why not the other.

XXII. *The Pope declareth all the world to be damned except his own Subjects.*

See the foresaid first Canon of *Innocents Laterane* Council.

Leo 10. *Abrog. Pragm. Sanct. Bul. in the* 17. General Council at *Laterane* saith [" *And seeing it is of necessity* " *to salvation that all the faithful of Christ be subject to the* " *Pope of* Rome, *as we are taught by the Testimony of* " *Divine Scripture and of the holy Fathers, and it is de-* " *clared in the constitution of Pope* Boniface *the* 7. *&c.*

Pope *Pius* 2. was converted from the supremacie of Councils by this Doctrine of a Cardinal which he approveth (or by the Popedom,) *Bul. Retract. in Bin. Vol.* 4. *p.* 514. [" I came to the Fountain of truth which the " holy Doctors both Greek and Latine shew, who with " one Voice say, that he cannot be saved that holdeth

" not

"not the Unity of the holy Church of *Rome*; and that "all those Virtues are maimed to him that refuseth to "obey the Pope of *Rome*; though he lye in Sackcloth "and Ashes, and fast and pray both Day and Night, and "seem in the rest or other things to fulfil the Law of "God.

(*Bellarmine* saith *de Eccles. l. 3. c. 5.*) that ["No man, "though he would, can be subject to Christ, that is not "subject to the Pope.] And therefore he saith that our Baptism implicitely subjecteth us to the Pope; or we are so baptized to him.

And saith *Gonzal. Rodericus in Godignus de rebus Abassin.* l. 2. c. 18. p. 323. to the Emperours Mother, [*I denyed that any one is subject to Christ, that is not subject to his Vicar.*] But said the old Woman to him, [*Neither I nor mine do deny obedience to S.* Peter: *we are in the same Faith now that we were in from the beginning: If that was not the right, why was there no one found in so many Ages and Generations that would warn us of our Errour?*] (See here what Tradition is, and whether the Papal Church and Charge was Universal.) The Jesuite answered, [*The Pope of* Rome *who is Pastor of the whole Church of Christ, could not in the years that are by-past send Teachers into* Abassia, *because the* Mahometans *incompassed all, and had left no passage to them; but now the Maritime way to* Æthiopia *is open, they can do that which they could not do before.*]

So that it seemeth, 1. Christ hath made the Pope Governour of Countries that he cannot send to, and set the poor man an impossible task. 2. He hath made it necessary to salvation to whole Kingdoms to believe in a Pope that they could never hear from; nor whether there were such a Man or City in the world. 3. Or else their

their Faith groweth new as the Sea passage is open. And wo to them if their new acquaintance with the Pope make all, all, all his Laws necessary to them, which they might have been saved without before. How much happier were they when they never heard of his Name?

See here, all you Jesuites, one old Woman is able unanswerably to confute you all, if she stand but on equal ground with you, and be not under your power, inquisition, or fear.

XXIII. *In so doing the Pope damneth and unchurcheth about two or three parts of the Christians upon earth, and so would destroy the Body Politick of Christ.*

For the Body is rather to be denominated from the greater part than from the less: Else why do Votes in General Councils go for the sense of the Church? And I have shewed before that the *Abassines*, *Copties* in *Egypt*, *Syrians*, *Armenians*, *Georgians*, *Greeks*, *Moscovites*, *Protestants*, and the rest, are far more (two or three to one) than all the Papists in the World. Much more when *Mahometanism* had not drowned so many Countries that were of the *Greek* Profession, was it so.

And how the Saviour of the World will take it for this Usurper to rob him of the most of his Flock, and damn most of his Church, (and corrupt the rest) consider and judge.

XXIV. *By so doing the Pope sets a Sect, or small divided Parcel of the Church, and calleth it the whole Church of Christ.*

Even as some Anabaptists (I hope not many) and other Sects appropriate Christianity, or true Church-Communion, *to themselves*, and say, *we are all the Church!* so doth the Pope: His Universal Church is *too small* for any understanding Christian to own, as such, and to be a Member of, as such. XXV. *The*

XXV. *The Pope damneth not only two or three parts of the Christian World, but also his own Representative Body, or Church, called Papists; such an Abaddon is he.*

Proved. The General Councils at *Constance* and *Basil* (to say nothing of many others) were the Representative Church of the Papists, and took it to be *de fide that a Council was above the Pope*: But the Pope hath damned them for this as an error, and for their deposing Popes: See *Concil. Later. sub Jul.* 2. and *sub Leone* 10. *& Concil. Florent.* Review the fore-cited Speeches of *Cajetan* and *Pighius* against them. Many more Councils have they condemned.

XXVI. *Yea Popes have damned Popes also, (and it is most to be feared lest they damn themselves, more than others.)*

I need not tell of *Marcellinus*, nor of *Honorius* condemned for an Heretick by divers Popes; nor repeat the Schismes and Damnations of each other therein, nor the Story of *Sergius* and *Formosus* and *Stephen*, *&c.* nor their forementioned wickedness. *Watson* in his *Quodlibets* tells you of *Bellarmines* Sentence against *Pope Sixtus Quintus*, [*Conceptis verbis, quantum capio, quantum sapio, quantum intelligo, Dominus noster Papa descendit ad infernum:*] And as others report him [*Qui sine pœnitentia vivit, & sine pœnitentia moritur, ad infernum descendit.*] See *Baronius* forecited.

XXVII. *Though the Pope condemn and unchurch so many, yet doth he tolerate in his own Church abundance of differences,* de fide, *and abundance of Controversies in Theologie, and abundance of Differences and Errours in great and dangerous matters of Morality, and abundance of Sects that variously serve God, so they will serve him, and uphold his Kingdom.*

1. The

1. The holy Scripture is all *de fide*, that is, a Divine Revelation to be believed: The Popes tolerated Translations that differ in many hundred places, or that *erred* so oft; and *Commentators* that differ in many hundred Texts as to the *Exposition*; yea, they tolerate those that deny the immaculate conception of the Virgin, after a General Council hath defined it.

2. He tolerateth vast Volumes of Theological Differences, in the School Doctors.

3. He tolerateth all the *Moral Doctrines* for *murdering Kings* before mentioned, and all those cited by Mr. *Clarkson* in his *Practical Divinity of the Church of Rome*, and all those mentioned in the Provincial Letters, and the Jesuites Morals, about Murder, Adultery, Perjury, Lying, seldom loving God, not loving him intensively above all, *&c.* See my *Key*, *&c. p. 59.*

4. He tolerateth abundance of Religious Sects, Jesuites, *Augustinians*, *Franciscans*, *Carthusians*, *&c.* who differ from each other in their serving God, as much as many of the Sects of Protestants, who are despised for their discord.

XXVIII. *He pretendeth a necessity to the ending of Controversies that he be the Judge, and yet will not end them by his Judgment, but continueth many hundred undecided.*

If we dispute with a Papist, and cite the Scriptures, they ask us presently, *who shall be Judge of the meaning of them?* As if the Pope would decide all: And yet to this day he will neither write any deciding Commentary on the Bible, nor on one Book of it; nor end the Controversies among his own Commentators. Nor will he end any of the fore-mentioned Controversies in *Morality*, of great importance.

XXIX. *He ſweareth all his Clergie never to take or interpret Scripture, but according to the unanimous ſenſe of the Fathers,* (ſee the *Trent* Oath:) *when yet the Fathers do not unanimouſly expound the Scripture, nor any one Book of it.*

And few Prieſts know what the Fathers are unanimous in, nor can do, unleſs they read them all; which by this Oath they ſeem obliged to do. Was not *Greg. Nazianz.* one of the Fathers? who ſaith, *Orat.* 18. ["I "would there were no Preſidency, nor Prerogative of "place, and tyrannical Priviledges; that ſo we might be "known only by Vertue, (or deſerts:) But now this "Right ſide and Left ſide, and Middle and Lower De-"gree, and Preſidency and Concomitancy, have begot "us many contentions to no purpoſe, and have driven "many into the Ditch, and have led them away to the "Region of Goats.] Is not this Hereſie, or worſe, with you?

Was not *Iſidore Peluſiota* a Father? (but a ſharp Reprover of proud and wicked Prieſts and Prelates) who ſaith, *lib.* 3. *Epiſt.* 223. *ad Hieracem* ["And when I have "ſhewed what difference there is between the ancient "Miniſtry and the preſent Tyranny, why do you not "crown and praiſe the lovers of Equality?] Doth not this deſerve a Fagot with you?

How ordinarily doth *Cajetan*, and others of yours, reject (deſervedly) the Expoſitions of Fathers? *Bellarmine* chargeth *Juſtin*, *Irenæus*, *&c.* with error, *de Beat. SS. li.* 1. *Cap.* 6. He ſaith, [*There is no truſt to be given to* Tertullian, *de Rom. Pont. li.* 4. *c.* 8. He ſaith, *Euſebius* was addicted to *Hereticks, and that* Cyprian *ſeemed to ſin mortally, de Rom. Pont. li.* 4. *c.* 7. *Dionyſ. Petavius de Trinit.* citeth the words of moſt of the ancienteſt

cienteſt as favouring Arrianiſm (almoſt like *Sondius* himſelf or *Philoſtorgius*;) and is fain to go to the [*Major Vote of the Nicene Council as the proof*,] that moſt of the ancients were not really of the *Arrians* mind. *Dallæus* hath told you more of the Fathers differences, and unſatisfactory expoſitions.

XXX. *He confeſſeth all the Scripture to be Gods infallible word, yea his Doctors have aſſerted its ſufficiency as a Divine Law; and yet his pretenſe of its Inſufficiency without Traditional ſupplement, is one of the Pillars of his Kingdom.*

The ſecond part needs no proof: For the firſt, the elder Popes oft aſſert it; And the School-men in their Prologue to the Sentences (*Scotus*, *Durandus* and many others:) But when Reformers confuted them by Scripture, they found that would not ſerve their turn, (as *Micaiah* of *Ahab*, it propheſyed not good of them but evil.) And ſince then, they cry up the *Church* and *Tradition*, and depreſs the ſufficiency of Scripture.

Even *Card. Richlieu pag.* 38. confeſſeth [" As for us, " we aſſert no other Rule but Scripture, neither of ano- " ther ſort, nor total: yea we ſay that it is the whole " Rule of our ſalvation, and that on a double account: " both becauſe it containeth immediately and formally " the ſum of our ſalvation; that is, all the Articles that " are neceſſary to mans ſalvation, by neceſſity of means; " and becauſe it mediately containeth what ever we " are bound to believe, as it ſends us to the Church to be " inſtructed by her, of whoſe infallibility it certainly con- " firmeth us.] Here the ſum of our Religion is granted.

At the Council of *Baſil Raguſius*'s oration (*Bin. p.* 299) ſaith [" That Faith and all things neceſſary to ſalvation, " both matters of belief and practice, are founded in the

"literal ſenſe of Scripture, and only from that may ar-
"gumentation be taken for the proving of thoſe things
"that are matters of Faith and neceſſary to ſalvation,
"and not from thoſe paſſages that are ſpoken by allego-
"ry, *&c.* And *ſup.* 7. ["The holy Scripture in the li-
"teral ſenſe ſoundly and well underſtood, is the infallible
"andmoſt ſufficient rule of Faith.] See more of his orati-
on opened in my *Key pag.* 93, 94, 95. The Teſtimony of *Bellarmine*, *Coſterus* and others I have fomerly recited.

XXXI. *The Pope teacheth us that we cannot truly believe the Articles of our Faith or the truth of Scripture, but becauſe of the Authority and Infallibility of the Pope and his Church declaring them; ſo that we muſt believe that the Pope is Chriſts Vicar and authorized by him, and made infallible, before we can believe that there is a Chriſt, or that he hath given any authority or gifts to any.*

This is not to be denyed: And *Knot* againſt *Chillingworth* hath no other ſhift, but to reſolve their belief of the Churches infallibility and authority, not into any word or donation of Chriſt, but into *Miracles wrought by the Church.* So that no man can be a Believer that is not firſt certain of the Papiſts Miracles (and how can millions know them, when they ſee them not? and in all my life I could never meet with one that ſaw them.) And he muſt next be certain that thoſe miracles prove the infallibility of the Pope; when yet they confeſs that they prove not the Infallibility of him *that doth them.* *Valentine Greatreaky* hath done and ſtill doth more wonderous cures by *touch* or *ſtroaking*, than ever I heard by any credible report that any Papiſt did: and yet he pretendeth to no Infallibility.

And thoſe Canonized Saints that have been moſt credibly famed for the greateſt Miracles, have born their

Teſtimony

Teſtimony againſt Popery, and therefore Popery was not confirmed by them. For inſtance, St. *Martin* is by his Diſciple and Friend *Sulpitius Severus* affirmed to have done more Miracles than I have ever credibly read done by any ſince the Apoſtles: I ſcarce except *Gregory Neocæſar:* And yet, whereas the Papal Councils give high priviledges, of pardon, *&c.* to thoſe that will take the Croſs to kill the *Waldenſes*, and compel Princes to it, and uphold their Kingdom by ſuch means, St. *Martin* ſeparated to the death from the Synods and Biſhops about him, for ſeeking the Magiſtrates Sword to be drawn againſt even *Priſcillian Gnoſticks*, and he profeſſeth that an *Angel* appeared to him and chaſtiſed him ſharply for once communicating with the Biſhops at the motion of *Maximus*, when he did it only to ſave mens lives, that were condemned as *Priſcillianiſts.* Here are Miracles againſt the very Pillars of Popery.

So alſo the *Egyptian* Monks were the moſt famous for Miracles of any People. And yet (as their Miracles were no confirmation of the errour of the *Anthropomorphites* which their ſimplicity and raſhneſs involved them in, ſo) they renounced Communion with the Church of *Rome*, and therefore confirmed it not by their Miracles.

How few Chriſtians be there on Earth, if none are ſuch but thoſe that by known Popiſh miracles believed the Pope to be infallible before they believed that there was a Chriſt?

And thus they muſt believe him to be Infallible not as Pope, but ſomewhat elſe: For to be Pope, is to be [*Chriſts pretended Vicar*:] And to believe that he is authorized or Infallible as *Chriſts Vicar*, before they believe there is a *Chriſt*, is a mad-mans contradiction and impoſſible.

ble. What Infallible wight then is it that we must first believe the Pope to be, before we believe him to be Pope? To what impudence will interest and faction carry men?

I will again recite the words of an honest Jesuit, *Joseph. Acosta de tempor. novis. li. 3. c. 3.* ["To all the "miracles of Antichrist, though he do great ones, the "Church shall boldly oppose the belief of the Scriptures: "And by the inexpugnable testimony of this truth, shall "by most clear light expel all his juglings as Clouds ---- "Signs are given to Infidels; Scriptures to Believers; "and therefore the primitive Church abounded with "miracles, when Infidels were to be called: But the "last, when the faithful are already called, shall rest more "on the Scripture than on miracles: yea I will boldly "say, that all miracles are vain and empty, unless they "be approved by the Scripture; that is, have a Do-"ctrine conform to the Scripture. But the Scripture "it self is of it self a most firm argument of truth.

Obj. "But he grants that Infidels had miracles. *Ans.* He lived long in the *West-Indies* among them, and in his *Treat.* of the *Convers. Ind.* and his *Hist. Ind.* he professeth that the Ignorance, Drunkenness and Wickedness of the Roman Priests there, was the great hinderance of their Conversion; but that *Miracles* there were none. God had not given them there any such gift.

Once more, Did the Miracle which *Thyræus de Dæmoniacis, p. 76.* reciteth out of *Prosper*, that [*A person possessed by the Devil was cured by drinking the Wine in the Eucharist*] confirm the Popes Religion, who hath cast out the Cup; or the Protestants that use it?

XXXII. *Though S.* Paul *say, Let every Soul be subject*

to

to the higher Powers, and give honour to whom honour is due, the Pope as far as he is able exempteth all his Clergie from the Government of the Magistrate; yea they are forbidden to fall down to Princes, or eat at their Tables, but Emperours must take them as equals.

The first part is commonly known: *Caranz. pag.* 395. reciteth this Decree of Pope *Nicholas*, that [" No Lay " man must judge a Priest, nor examine any thing of his " life: And no Secular Prince ought to judge the facts of " any Bishops or Priests whatsoever.

The Eighth General Council at *Constantinople* saith, *Can.* 14. [" Ministers must not fall down to Princes, nor " eat at their Tables, nor debase themselves to them; " but Emperours must take them as equals.

XXXIII. *The Pope confesseth every word of our Objective Religion to be true; for all his killing and damning us as Hereticks.*

Proved before: We have not a word of our Objective Religion, but the Sacramental Covenant, and its Exposition in the *Creed*, *Lords Prayer*, and *Decalogue*, and the *Canonical Scripture*, which we receive. And they confess all this to be infallibly true, and so justifie all our Positive Religion.

XXXIV. *The Popes to this day will not tell the Church so much as what a Christian is, and what must make a man a Member of their Church, in the Essentials of a Member.* Of which more anon.

XXXV. *While the Decrees of General Councils are made* quoad nos *the Churches Faith, the Pope will never let us know how big our Faith must be, nor when we shall have all.*

If every General Council add new Articles (or many) *quoad nos*, who knoweth when they will have done?

done? and whether we have yet half the Christian Faith, or not?

XXXVI. *The Popes Religion maketh Contradictions necessary to be believed*; that is, *impossibilities*.

The Contradictions of *Transubstantiation* I have opened in my [*Full Satisfaction*] Confirmed General Councils they commonly agree do make Decrees which must necessarily be believed: And it is notorious, that such Decrees are Contradictory. The General Council at *Constance* confirmed by *Martin* 5. and that at *Basil* confirmed by *Felix* 5. do make it *de fide* for a Council to be above the Pope. *Bin. p.* 43. 79. 96. *Conc. Basil. Sess. ult.* they say, [" Not one of the skilful did ever doubt, but " that the Pope was subject to the judgment of a Gene- " ral Council in matters of Faith; and that he cannot " without their consent dissolve or remove a General " Council; yea and that this is an Article of Faith, which " without destruction of salvation cannot be denyed, and " that *de fide* the Council is above the Pope, and that he " is a Heretick that is against this.] *Eugenius* also owned this Council, *Bin. ib. p.* 42.

But the Councils of *Florence*, and at the *Laterane sub Jul.* 2. and *sub Leone* 10. say the clean contrary.

The 6. Council at *Constant.* approved by Pope *Adrian* is now said by them to have many errors.

XXXVII. *The Pope arrogateth power to alter the constitutions of the Spirit of God in the holy Scriptures.*

Proved. The Council of *Constance* taking away the Cup saith [" Though in the Primitive Church this Sa- " crament was received by Believers under both " kinds, *&c.*] yea though Christ so instituted it, yet they altered it.

I elsewhere cited Pope *Innocents* words [*By the fulness of*

of our Power we can dispense with the Law, being above the Law.] And the Gloss oft saith, [*The Pope dispenseth against the Apostle, against the Old Testament, &c.*

The Council of *Trent* say, *Sess.* 21. *cap.* 1, 2. that [*This power was always in the Church, that in dispensing the Sacraments, saving the substance of them, it may ordain or change things as it should judge most expedient to the profit of the Receiver.* (But is not the Cup of the substance, as truly as the Bread?)

Andrad. Def. Conc. Trid. li. 2. *p.* 236. [" Hence it is " plain that they do not erre that say, the Popes of *Rome* " may sometimes dispense with Laws made by *Paul*, and " the four first Councils. And *Vasquez* saith *To.* 2. *Disp.* 216. *N.* 60. [" Though we grant that this was a Pre- " cept of the Apostles, yet the Church and Popes might " on just causes abrogate it: For the power of the Apo- " stles was no greater than the power of the Church and " Pope in bringing in Precepts.]

One of *Luthers* Opinions opposed as Heretical by *Leo* 10. was this, [*It is certain that it is not in the hand of the Church or Pope to make Articles of Faith.*] See more in my *Key*, *p.* 243, 244.

XXXVIII. *The Pope setteth up a Publick Worship of God, in a Tongue not understood by most of the Worshippers; and forbiddeth men, without Licence to read the Scriptures in a known Tongue.*

Practice and the *Trent* Council prove both these.

XXXIX. *The Pope determineth that the Image of Christ be reverenced with equal honour as the holy Scriptures.*]

So it is decreed *Concil. Constant.* the eighth *General Can.* 3. And yet Images are mans work, and at the best unnecessary, and the holy Scriptures are Gods work by his Spirit, and the Law by which we must live, and be judged at the last.

XL. *And when all this Power over the whole Earth is thus claimed, there is no possible means left for any mortal man, much less for the* Antipodes, *to know who is the man that hath this Power, and whom on pain of damnation we must obey, and believe in before we can believe in Christ.*

Proved: If there be any possibility of knowing it, it must be either, 1. By personal qualifications of mind; 2. Or by right of election; 3. Or of Ordination; 4. Or of Possession; 5. Or of Acceptance by the Church after Possession. I cannot Imagine any other way. But there is no possibility of knowing who is Pope by any of *these wayes.*

I. The first is not pretended by them: But anon we shall thence prove their *Nullity* for want of necessary Qualifications.

II. If *Election* will tell us, then it is either *any Election whatsoever*, or else *Election by authorized Persons.* Not the first; else the *Turks*, or the *Greeks*, or the Adversaries of *Rome* might elect a Pope: And an hundred might be elected at once several ways. Not the later; For if any *one way of Election* be necessary, Popes were no Popes when that way failed: Sometime they were elected by the *People of Rome* (and were *they* the Chusers for *all the world*?) Sometimes by the People and the *Presbyters*: Sometimes by the *Neighbour Bishops* and Ordainers: Sometimes by the Emperours: And lastly by the Cardinals. If one way only be valid, the rest were invalid: And how shall we prove which? If any of these ways are valid; then six men or five may be chosen at once by the several ways: And where is the proof?

III. If *Ordination* be the notifying Title, then, 1. Those Lay men that were put in full possession unordained were no

no Popes; and where then is the Succeſſion? 2. And who is it that hath that *ordaining Authority*? If ſome Biſhops ordain one, and ſome another, and ſo twenty (as they long did divers in many years Schiſm) which of theſe is the true Pope? or is it *all*?

IV. If *Poſſeſſion* were the Title, then the *Turk* may be Pope; or he that can get it by the Sword: Then there can be no Uſurper, but the ſtrongeſt hath beſt Right. Then he that kept at *Rome* had better title than he that was in *Germany*, or at *Avignion*.

V. If it be the Churches *after acceptance*; then, 1. He was an Uſurper before. 2. And what or who is that *Accepting Church*? Sure they that muſt make a Pope of no Pope, by after acceptance, ſhould have the antecedent Election: Elſe Popes muſt all be firſt Uſurpers, before they are true Popes. But, 1. If it muſt be the *major part* of the *Chriſtian World*, then there is no Pope, becauſe two parts are againſt him. If it muſt be one Sect of Chriſtians only like the Papiſts, that will but think themſelves the Church, or better than the reſt; who is it that can prove their title to this Choice? And muſt it be *All of them*, or but *Part*? If *All*, 1. How ſhall we ever know it? Never ſuch a thing was tryed. 2. And then there was no Pope in the 40 or 50 years Schiſm. If it muſt be *Part*, how ſhall we ever know *which part* it muſt be? If the *major* or the *melior*, how ſhall it be ever tryed and known in a diviſion? None to this day knoweth who had the *major* or *melior* part in many a Schiſm.

If they ſay that *ſilent non-oppoſition* is *Conſent*. I Anſwer, That's a known Falſhood, when moſt men, even a thouſand to one, have neither Call nor Opportunity to ſignifie their diſſent effectually; and when no wiſe men that love their time and peace, will run to *Rome* by thouſands

out of all Kingdoms, to tell them their dissent.

2. But it was no *silent submission*, when *several Popes* were upheld by *several Kingdoms*. So that there is no way of certain notice who is the true Pope, but he must go for the man, as *Eugenius* 4. did after his Deposition, who can keep possession, which is no title at all.

2. Yea, I prove certainly, according to their own Principles, that *there is no Pope* at *Rome*, nor *hath been* for many an hundred years.

For they hold themselves, that the Right must be derived by an uninterrupted Succession from S. *Peter*, (and call us no Ministers for want of Succession:) But that they have no such uninterrupted Succession is notorious.

For, 1. An Infidel and Heretick Pope, so openly judged, can be no Pope: Else a *Turk* might be Pope. For he that is no Christian, is no Christian Bishop. But Popes (before mentioned) have been judged Infidels, Hereticks, incarnate Devils.

2. A Pope actually deposed as an uncapable wicked Heretick, by a General Council, was no Pope: Yet such was *Eugenius* 4. who yet kept the place, and the rest are his Successors.

3. There have been sometimes several years without any Pope at all: And if two or three years make no interruption, how shall we know how long time doth it?

4. *Baronius*, *Genebrard*, and others aforementioned, confess that for 50 of them together they were Apostatical, and deserve not to be named among the Popes, being wicked men, made and ruled by Whores, *&c.* Where then is the succession?

And if it were possible for those at *Rome* to know that there is a Pope, and to know who and which is he, yet how

how ſhould all the reſt of the world have any aſſurance of it? You'll ſay, it is not neceſſary: Poſſeſſion and common Report muſt ſatisfie them in *China*, *Congo*, *Abaſſia*, and the *Phillipines*, &c.

Anſw. No Building can be ſtronger than its Foundadation, nor Concluſion than its Premiſes: How then ſhall ſuch men have aſſurance of their Religion when they muſt take it on the Credit of a Pope as infallible of whom they have no aſſurance? And how ſhall they be certain that they are of the right Church, when they are uncertain who is the Head whom they muſt be ſubjects to?

CHAP. VII.

What a PAPIST is.

II. HAving ſhewed *what a Pope is*, I am next hence to tell you what we Proteſtants take a *Papiſt to be*.

And firſt as to the *name*, it is equivocal: There are ſo many ſorts that are called commonly by the one name of *Papiſts*, that it is hard to enumerate and deſcribe them all.

1. There are ſome that believe that the *Pope* is but a *Humane Creature*, that hath run up his power into Tyranny by abuſe, and it were well if he were either down, or reduced to his firſt ſtate: But they take themſelves to be as thoſe that live under other abuſive, oppreſſing or tyrannical Governours, who muſt live in Patience and Submiſſion, and are not bound to ruine themſelves, by oppoſing him in vain; and though he impoſe on them many

many things which they like not, but had rather they were reformed, yet it being not in their power, and Princes and Magistrates commanding them the same, they take *Conformity* to be orderly, and *Nonconformity* to be unpeaceable and of ill fame; And if any of the things commanded them prove sinful, they hope God will forgive them (for bowing in the house of *Rimmon*) and will lay it on Popes, Princes and Prelates, and not on them that are not bound to study Controversies; and who do what they do but in obedience and for peace (pretenses that quiet their Consciences in self-saving Conformity:) I verily think that the greater part of those called Papists in all the world, are of this *self-saving sort*. As we see in all Countries that the greater number are or seem to be of the Religion of those in power, be it what it will be. And we ordinarily hear that the common people will thus talk against the Popes Doctrines and Practices, and yet quiet themselves on such terms of *Conformity* as I here describe.

II. Another sort called Papists do believe that the Pope is a meer humane creature also, not over all the world but in the Empire and where Princes let him: And consequently as men set him up, men might take him down. But yet that it is an *Orderly* Institution, as Kings and Emperors, and that his place is *Lawful*, and that it is the duty of the Church to obey him, especially when Princes also do command it: And that men have power from God to make, as *National*, *Provincial*, and *Patriarchal Churches* and *Rulers*, so also an *Universal Church* and *Ruler for Order and Unity sake* over many Countries, and that it is good and desirable to these ends.

Of these there are two sorts. 1. One sort take the

Papacie

Papacie and *Patriarchs* to be a lawful and laudable institution of *Constantine*, confirmed by other Princes. 2. The other sort take them to be laudable Institutions of *General Councils*, or else of *particular consenting Bishops* before the first General Council (whom thy call the *Church*.)

III. Another sort called Papists, do believe the Pope (as the former) to be a *humane Creature*, *viz.* of the first or ancient Bishops by mutual consent; but that it was a *necessary thing*, which by Gods General Laws, and his special Inspiration, they did well, and were bound to do for the Churches concord and strength; and that it is not lawful for the Church now to alter it, or any Prince in his Dominions.

These also are of three sorts: 1. Some think that the *Roman* Seat may be altered, and the Church upon just cause may remove the Primacy to another Bishop. This seemeth to be the opinion of Cardinal *Cusanus* afore cited *de Concord.* who saith, The Church might make the Bishop of *Trent* chief. 2. Others seem rather to think, that God hath by Decree annexed the Supremacy to *Rome*, and yet (as *R. Smyth*, the Bishop of *Calcedon*, and Ruler of the *English* Popish Clergy afore cited) think, that it is not *de fide*, that the Pope is *Peters* Successor. 3. Others say that they are not sure but *God* may destroy *Rome*, and remove the Primacy; but *Men* may not do it.

IV. The whole *Greek* Church seem yet of the second or third opinion, (that the Pope had a just Primacy in one Empire, which was justly removed to *Constantinople*:) But there are some that think the Pope had also a just Primacy in all the *Christian World*, and yet that he hath it but by *Humane Institution*.

V. There are other that think the Pope is the Univer-

sal

ſal Head by *Divine Inſtitution*; even as S. *Peter's* Succeſſor, by derivation of the Power which Chriſt gave *Peter*.

And as about the *Foundation*, ſo about the *Subject* and the *Meaſure* of Power, yea *who is the true Chief Ruler* over the Univerſal Church, there are theſe ſeveral ſorts of Popery.

I. Some believe that it is *General Councils* that are the Subject or Poſſeſſors of *Supreme Church Power* and *Infallibility*, and that the Pope is but the firſt in order of the five Patriarchs in ſuch *Councils*; who hath no neceſſary right to call them, nor no negative Voice in them, nor any Government over the other Patriarchs, or their Churches; but only the firſt Seat, if he be there; juſt as the Patriarch of *Alexandria* firſt, and of *Conſtantinople* after had when the Patriarch of *Rome* was abſent. And thus indeed it was in the Empire, for a long time. But thoſe five Patriarchs ruled not *all the World*; no more than our two Provincial Archbiſhops do.

II. Others called Papiſts do go farther, and believe that General Councils indeed have the ſupreme Legiſlative Power, and the chief Executive while they ſit, and are the Seat of Infallibility: But becauſe they are not to be *always* or *ordinary*, God hath not left the *four Patriarchs*, and *all the World*, ungoverned in the Intervals; but the *Roman* Pope is the *Supreme Governour of the World*, when there is no General Council: Yet ſo that he muſt Govern by *their Laws* or Canons.

III. Another ſort (and I think the moſt numerous among the Learned) called Papiſts, hold that *Neither the Pope alone, nor the Council alone, are the Seat or Poſſeſſors of the ſupreme Legiſlative Power*, or the *Infallibility, nor of the ſupreme judging and executive power*

ſedente

ſedente concilio; *but it is both of them agreeing* or conjunct: And two Fallibles joyning, become one Infallible.

IV. Another ſort of Papiſts, and very numerous eſpecially in *Italy*, hold, that the Pope alone is Supreme and Infallible in Legiſlation and *Judgment*, and that Councils are but his Counſellors, to prepare Laws, to which his *Fiat* giveth *Authority and Infallibility.*

All theſe indeed are commonly called PAPISTS, becauſe that more or leſs they are Subjects of the Pope. But who can give *one definition*, or the ſame *marks* of men that are really of ſo many minds? If I deſcribe one ſort, the other will ſay, this is not our Opinion; you do us wrong. And ſo of all the reſt.

And here you may ſee, that when the Queſtion is, *Whether a Papiſt may be ſaved*? and *Whether a Papiſt be a Heretick*? or the like; that it cannot be well anſwered, till we know of which ſort of Papiſts you ſpeak.

But becauſe I find that already my Writing is ſwelled beyond my firſt intent, I will give you the Properties or *inadequate conceptions* of only one ſort of Papiſts, which is the third ſort in the laſt diſtribution, who hold the *Soveraignty and Infallibility to be in the Pope and Council conjunct, and that by Divine Right:* Becauſe if I ſpeak of any of the other ſorts, I find they fly for refuge hither, and moſt Writers go upon this ground, and will own nothing as their Religion but what is in *Approved General Councils.*

And here I deſire the Reader to peruſe what I have ſaid in my [*Full and eaſie ſatisfaction, &c.*] out of *Veron*, and others, as they deſcribe their Faith themſelves.

I. *A PAPIST of this ſort is one that believeth that the Pope and his Council, or Church, is Infallible in propoſing*

the will of Christ; and believeth in Christ, and receiveth the Gospel as true, for the Authority and Infallibility of this Pope and Council, and hereon layeth all the hopes of his salvation, as on the Churches Faith: And all this Authority and Infallibility he believeth before he believeth that there is a Pope or a Church of Christ, or a Christ indeed, or a promise or gift from Christ of any Authority or Infallibility to them: Much more before he knoweth who is the true Pope, and which are true General Councils, or whether ever there were any such, or what it is that they have decreed to be believed.

1. That they take all their Faith in Christ and the Gospel on the credit of the Church (that is, the Pope and Council) proposing it, the moderatest of all this sort profess; as out of *Veron*, and others, I proved as aforecited. Hence it is that one tells us that the Scripture is so full of seeming Contradictions and Improbabilities, that he would no more believe it than *Esop*'s Fables, were it not for the Authority of the Church. Another said [Would I ever believe the Trinity, the Incarnation, that if you lay a man to dye in a close Chest of Lead or Marble his Soul could get out to Heaven, that the Body shall rise again, *&c.* were it not for the Authority of the Church?]

2. They believe this Infallibility and Authority of the *Pope* before they can believe that there is any Pope at all. For to be a *Pope* is essentially to be *Christs Vicar* as they describe him: And, as I said, it is impossible to believe that *Christ hath a Vicar*, before they believe that he is *Christ*. As it is to believe a *Son* without a Parent.

3. They believe the *Infallibility* and *Authority* of the *Church*, (as they profess) before they believe that there is any *Church*: For to be a *Church* is essentially to be a

Society

Society of *Christians*: And he that yet believeth not that *Christ* is truly *Christ*, cannot believe that *Christians* are truly *Christians*, save *de nomine*; nor that *Christ* hath a Church: For they are Relatives, as *wife* and *Husband*.

4. They *believe* the *Infallibility* and *Authority* of the *Church*, that is, the Pope and *Council*, before they believe that *Jesus is the Christ*; For they profess to believe in him, because of the said Churches Authority and Infallibility: And the Premises go before the Conclusion.

5. They believe the said Infallibility and Authority of the Church, before they believe that ever *Christ gave* them such *Authority* and *Infallibility*: For they cannot believe that Christ gave it them, before they believe that there is a *Christ*, and a *word of gift*.

And now is not here a Riddle hard enough to pose the wisest? *Which way do all these Believers, through all the world, come to know that the Pope and Council, or Church, are authorized and Infallible, before they believe that Christ ever gave it them? which way do they think that they came by it?* Let him unriddle it that can.

6. They believe thus in the Pope, before they know *what a Pope is*, or *who is he* that they must thus believe in. For alas, how can all or any in the world know what is necessary to make a Pope? what *Election*? what *Ordination*? what *Qualification*? and whether the man *had* all these? And of divers Pretenders *which is he* that hath the proofs of a true title?

7. They believe thus in *Councils*, when they know not what *Councils* are true, and what not; nay whether ever there were any: For I have elsewhere fully proved that there never was any, nor ever will be, that are truly Universal as to all the Christian World.

8. Much leſs do theſe beginners know certainly, what General Councils have decreed to be believed by thoſe that will be ſaved.

That which will be ſaid to all this is, that *It is not neceſſary that all men receive their Faith from Councils; it is ſufficient if it be from the Church-real, though not from the Repreſentative.*

Anſ. Very good: 1. Elſe no man was a Chriſtian, nor could be, before the firſt General Council, which was above 300 years.

2. But ſtill this anſwereth none of the Contradictions about believing in and from the *Pope*: May we all take our Faith from the Church-real, without taking it from the Pope, or not? If *yea*, we may poſſibly be good friends at laſt. If *not*, all the Contradictions about him are ſtill upheld by you.

3. And if you muſt take it from the *Authority* and *Infallibility* of the *Church Real*, ſtill all the Contradictions will follow as if you took it from *Councils*: For can you believe that this Church is *Chriſts Church*, and hath this power and gift from him, before you believe that he is Chriſt, and that ever he made ſuch a gift or promiſe to them?

4. And *who* or *what* is this *Real Church*, that muſt be *firſt known* to be thus impowered and *infallible*: Is it *ſome few*, or *many*, or muſt it be the *moſt*? If a *few* or *many*, you profeſs that they may be *Hereticks*, and have not that authority or gift. If it muſt be *all*, or the *greater* part; 1. Then the Church of *Rome* goeth down, that is at moſt but a third part. 2. How ſhall every poor man (or any man) know which is the judgment of the major part? Can he take the Votes of all the Chriſtian World? 3. And have all that were converted in the Apoſtles days and

and ſince, firſt known the Major Vote of the Chriſtians, or were they converted by the foreknown Infallibility or Authority of the Majority? (or of the Pope?)

Some will ſay, we ſee the Madneſs of this Popery, but how then do you ſay that the *faith muſt be received, if not from* the Church? I anſwer I have told you at large in a Treatiſe called *The Reaſons of the Chriſtian Religion*, and briefly in a ſmaller Treatiſe called *The certainty of Chriſtianity without Popery*

Briefly, *Judging is one thing*, and *Teaching is another thing*. Before I ſubmit to the *Deciſion* of a *Judge* I muſt know his *Commiſſion* or *Authority*; and I muſt then ſtand to his Sentence which way ever he decide the Caſe. Men be not converted to Chriſtianity by ſuch *Judges*, but by *Teachers*; Nor will I believe the Judge if he ſay *there is no Chriſt, no Life to come, &c.* But a *Teacher* is to make intelligible to his Hearer or Scholar, the *evidence of truth* which is in the matter taught, and to draw men to believe by telling them thoſe true reaſons upon which he did believe himſelf: And no man takes him for his Teacher that he is perſwaded knoweth no more than himſelf. And the greater reputation of Knowledge and Honeſty the Teacher hath, the eaſier we apply our minds to learn of him, and a humane truſt or faith prepareth us to receive that evidence of truth which may beget a Divine Faith by the help of Grace. But ſtill the Learner truly believeth no more than he thus learneth. And I may hear a ſtranger tell what he hath to ſay, and be convinced by the evidence that he giveth me of the truth, though I know not of any *Authority* that he hath to teach me, much leſs *judicially* to *decide* the Caſe. I little doubt but moſt that were converted by the Apoſtles themſelves, were perſwaded to believe in Chriſt by the *evidence of truth*

truth propoſed (the Spirit co-operating) before they knew of any *Authority* of the Apoſtles; much leſs before they heard what they ſaid in a *General Council*, or what was the Vote of the *Univerſal Church*; or what *any Pope* ſaid as *Ruler* of the reſt. Theſe things are very plain and ſure, and they that will be wilfully blinded by faction, and prejudice, and worldly intereſt againſt plain truth, have no excuſe if they periſh in darkneſs.

II. *A PAPIST (of this ſort) is one that believeth that the Pope of* Rome *is the rightful Governour of all the world; that is, that all Chriſtians immediately, and all Infidels and Heathens mediately, are bound by God to obey him, as Chriſt's Vicegerent on Earth: And that he, with his Council, is thus an Univerſal Lawgiver and Judge to all Kings, States, and Perſons, that dwell round about the Earth.*

But a Proteſtant denyeth this, and holdeth that there is no Univerſal Monarch, or Legiſlator, to all the world, but God and our Saviour; and that he hath made no ſuch Vice-Chriſt, or Vicegerent; and that ſuch a Claim is High-Treaſon, as uſurping his Prerogative. And that if Pride had not *in tantum* made them mad, no men could think themſelves thus capable of Governing all the World. Proteſtants believe that there is no ſuch thing on Earth, as an Univerſal Church headed by any mortal Head, Pope or Council, but that Chriſt is the only Univerſal Governour or Head.

III. *This Papiſt is one that holdeth, that the Church of Chriſt on Earth is no bigger than the Popes Dominion, and that it is neceſſary to ſalvation to be ſubject to the Pope; and conſequently he unchurcheth two or three parts of the Chriſtian World, and damneth moſt of the Body of Chriſt, and robbeth him of the greateſt part of his Kingdom, as far*

far as denying his Right amounts to: And consequently is a notorious Schismatick or Sectary, appropriating the Church title only to his Sect.

This is proved before from the Masters of their Religion.

IV. *This Papist is one that holdeth, that those Councils which were General as to one Empire, were General as to all the Christian world: And that such General Councils there must be, (if it please the Pope to call them,) though they must come from all the Quarters of the Earth, and whence they have no Sea passage, and out of the Empires of many Princes, and many that are Enemies to the Christian Name, and perhaps at Wars with Christians; and when the Voyage or Journey is such, that if the Churches be deprived of a thousand Bishops, twenty of them are never like to live to return home to the remotest Nations. Nor could they converse as a Council, by reason of the number and diversity of Languages, if they were equally gathered.*

Or they hold, that if a small part of the Christian world assemble (*as at* Trent) *when the rest cannot come, this is an Universal Council of and to all the Christian World.*

V. *This Papist is one that holdeth, If a fallible Pope and a fallible General Council do but agree, their Decrees are infallible: As if an unlearned Pope* (e. g. *that understands not the Text of Scripture in the Original*) *and an unlearned Council* (*as to the most*) *should agree, their Decrees would be learned*; e. g. *in judging which is the true Translation of a Tongue which they never understood.* As if ten purblind men if they meet together might produce the Effects of the cleareſt ſight, or Fools by conjunction become wiſe.

VI. "He holdeth that Tradition from Fathers to "Children

" Children is the ſure way of conveying all the matter " of Faith and Religion ; and yet that the greateſt Gene- " ral Councils, which are the Church repreſentative, " may erre in matter of Faith, and have erred ; unleſs a " Pope (who is fallible) approve of their Decrees.

VII. " And when he hath truſted to this way of Tra- " dition, he denyeth the Judgment and Tradition profeſ- " ſed by the greater half of the Chriſtian World.

VIII. " He believeth that all men are bound on pain " of damnation to believe that the Senſes and perception " of all men in the World are deceived, in apprehending " that after Conſecration there is true Bread and Wine in " the Sacrament. And he that will ſo believe his own " and others Senſes, ſhould ſuffer as an Heretick, and be " rooted out of all the Dominions of all Chriſtian Lords " on Earth. So merciful is he to his Neighbours.

For an approved General Council hath decreed this, and ſuch Councils are his Religion. Were it his own Father or Mother, Wife or Child, that cannot thus renounce all his own and other mens Senſes, and believe that there is no Bread or Wine in ſpight of his ſight, taſte, touch, *&c.* he believeth that they ſhould be *burnt as Hereticks*, or *exterminated.* He may be a *good natur'd* man that is loth it ſhould be ſo ; or he may be one that is *ignorant* of his own Religion, and doth not know that this is one Article of Popery ; or he may be an *unconſcionable* man, that will not obey that which he knoweth to be his Religion ; or he may be *unable* to execute ſuch Laws: But *it is his Religion* to believe that he ought to do it.

IX. " If he be a Temporal Lord of a Proteſtant Coun- " try, it is part of his Religion to take himſelf obliged to " root out, deſtroy, or burn all his Proteſtant Subjects, and " all others that deny Tranſubſtantiation.

Obj. *The King of* France, *and some others, do it not.*

Anſ. No man is bound to do that which he *cannot do.* But if he *can do it*, and he be a *Papiſt*, by the expreſs words of an Approved General Council he is bound to do it, and to *believe* that it is his duty. I ſpeak not of what *men do*, but what their *Religion binds them to do:* Though intereſt or good nature hinder them.

X. "He believeth that all Temporal Lords that will "not firſt take an Oath thus to root out their Subiects, "and then do it, may be firſt Excommunicated by the "Pope, and then depoſed if they repent not, and their "Dominions be given to be ſeized by another Papiſt "that will do it.

The words of the Council are before cited.

XI. "He believeth that in this caſe the Pope may ab-"ſolve all the Subjects of ſuch Temporal Lords from "their Oaths, and Duties of Allegiance or Fidelity to "ſuch Rulers.

This alſo is expreſs in the Councils words,

XII. "He is one that believeth that the Priviledges of "the *Roman* Church were given it by the Fathers, be-"cauſe it was the Imperial Seat, and therefore *Conſtan-*"*tinople* had after equal Priviledges: (*For ſo ſaith the* "*forecited General Council:*) And yet he believeth the "clean contrary, even that *Rome*'s Priviledges were gi-"ven it by S. *Peter*, and *Conſtantinople*'s are not equal. (For Popes and Councils alſo are for this.)

XIII. "He believeth that it is *de fide* that General "Councils are above Popes, and may judge them, and "depoſe them if there be cauſe, even as Hereticks or "Infidels, Adulterers, Murderers, Simoniſts, *&c.* And yet "he believeth that all this is falſe, and the contrary "true.

For the approved General Councils of *Basil* and *Constance* say the first, (and others;) and those fore-cited at the *Laterane* and *Florence* say the latter.

XIV. "He maketh uncharitableness, and bold damning all others, a comfortable mark of the safety of his state, and the truth of his Religion, and our Charity a mark that ours is worse; whereas Christ hath said, *By this shall all men know that ye are my Disciples, if ye love one another.*

It's usual with them to say, [*You say that a Papist may be saved, and we say that a Protestant cannot; therefore we are in the safer state.*] As if *our* case were ever the more dangerous for *their* condemning us. As if a man that doteth in a Fever, should say to those about him, [*You say that I may live, and I say that all you are mortally sick; therefore my case is better than yours.*] God saith, *Judge not, that ye be not judged*; and *who art thou that judgest another mans Servant*? And these men hope their case is safe, because they sin against this Law, and damn the most of the Universal Church.

XV. "A Papist thinketh that all the Bible is not big "enough, or hath not enough in it, to save those that "believe and practise it, or to make us a saving Religi"on; but other Tradition must be received with equal "reverence; and the Decrees of all the approved Gene"ral Councils must make it up.

XVI. "He confesseth every Article and word of the "Religion of the Protestants to be infallibly true, and "yet holdeth that they are to be burnt and damned as "Hereticks.

For he confesseth every part of the Canonical Scripture to be true, and we have no more in our (objective, positive) Religion, not a word. Our Negations of Popery

pery are not properly our Religion, any more than our ſpeaking againſt Diſeaſes is our Health: But as our health containeth our own freedom from an hundred diſeaſes which we never thought of, as well as thoſe that we once had or feared; ſo our Faith and Religion is *free from* Popery, and containeth that which is againſt it.

XVII. "A Papiſt is for ſwearing men to take Scripture "in that ſenſe as the holy Mother Church doth hold, and "hath held it: Whereas, 1. Their Church hath given "them no Commentary on the Scripture, one way or "other. 2. And their Tranſlations have been altered in "many hundred places by *Clement* 8. and *Sixtus* 5. ſo "that their Clergy is ſworn to take one Tranſlation to "to be right one year, and a different one to be right "the next.

XVIII. "They are for ſwearing men to take or inter-"pret Scripture but according to the unanimous ſenſe of "the Fathers, and conſequently never to interpret the "moſt of it at all.

XIX. "A Papiſt hath a thriving Faith and Religion, "which groweth bigger and bigger, as faſt as General "Councils add new Decrees; ſo that they know not "when they ſhall have all: And yet they cry out againſt "novelty and change, and boaſt of Antiquity.

XX. "He holdeth that Prieſts or Prelates may not "fall down to Princes, or eat at their Tables, nor debaſe "themſelves to them; but Emperours muſt take them "as equals. *Concil. Gen.* 8. *Conſt. Can.* 14.

XXI. "He is ſatisfied that their Church hath a Judge "of Controverſies, though he decide them not: And "he gloryeth in the Unity and great Concord of their "Church, whoſe Doctors differ *de fide* even in the Ex-"poſition of many hundred Texts of Gods Word; and

"where they differ in the Morals before cited, about "Murder, killing excommunicate Kings, *&c.* and in "Volumes of Controverſies. And yet he looketh upon "far ſmaller differences among us with great offenſe, as "if they were intolerable, and were ſo many different "Religions: And all becauſe in all their differences they "agree in one Pope. As if it were not as good an Uni-"on to agree in one God, one Chriſt, one Spirit, one "Body or Church of Chriſt, one Faith (Creed and Scrip-"ture) one Baptiſmal Covenant, and one Hope of life "eternal, *Eph.* 4. 3, 4, 5, 6. which is the Union that "God deſcribeth.

XXII. "He believeth that the Pope doth juſtly take "away from the People one half of the ſubſtance of "Chriſts own Sacrament, and deny them that which "they hold to be his very Blood.

XXIII. "They believe that they ought not to read the "Scripture tranſlated without a Licence. So ſaith *Con. Trid.*

XXIV. "They believe that the Image of Chriſt is to "be reverenced equally with the holy Scriptures.

It is a Councils words before cited: Yea they muſt believe the ſecond Council at *Nice*, that *Latria is to be given only to God:* and yet a canonized S. *Thomas* 3. *q.* 25. *a.* 3. *&* 4. maintaineth that *Latria* or Divine Worſhip is to be given, 1. To the Image of Chriſt, 2. To the Croſs that he dyed on, 3. And to the Sign of the Croſs. And how largely *Jac. Nauclantus*, *Cabrera*, and multitudes of the Schoolmen are for it, ſee my *Key*, *p.* 165, *&c.*

XXV. "They will publickly pray to God, and praiſe "him, in an unknown Tongue, becauſe the Pope will "have it ſo.

XXVI. "They think that the far greateſt part of the "Body of Chriſt are tormented in the Flames of Purga-

tory,

"tory, to make satisfaction to Gods Justice for some "Sins, notwithstanding Christs sufficient satisfaction.

XXVII. "Expecting to go to the Flames of Purgato- "ry when they dye, they cannot possibly be willing to "leave this World, and consequently must be world- "lings, and never truly willing to dye. For the basest "condition on Earth will seem to them more desirable "than Purgatory.

XXVIII. "They think that the Flames of Purgatory "do perfect mens preparation for Heaven: whereas he "is readiest for Heaven that is likest to those in Heaven "and most holy, and that is they that most love God! "And they that are angry here with every one that hurt- "eth him, and do not think that tormenting men will "win their love, yet look that the torments of Purgato- "ry should help us to love God, better than all the mer- "cies on Earth will do.

XXIX. "The generality of Papists believe a fallible "Priest, or Printer, or such other person, telling them "what is the Faith of the Universal Church, and yet "think that this is an Infallible Faith.

XXX. "A Papist is one that layeth his hopes of sal- "vation upon his belief of and obedience to a Pope "which by their own Principles is no Pope, and a Ge- "neral Council which is no General Council, never was, "nor never will be; and on his Communion with a "Catholick Church which is no Catholick Church, but "a Sect. All which hath been proved already, and moreshall be.

I have told you in part what we take a Papist to be. Some things, before mentioned in the description of a Pope, have been here necessarily repeated.

CHAP.

CHAP. VIII.

What the Papists Church is: (called the Roman Catholick Church.)

WHat their CHURCH is may so easily be gathered from what is said, that I shall say but little more of it.

In General, *It is a Society called Ecclesiastical, constituted of such a Head, and such Members, as I have described.*

Particularly, I. "It is a Humane Church as to the Efficient Cause of its Form; made by Man, as distinct "from that Church-form which was instituted by Christ; "even by the Fathers, because that *Rome* was the Imperial Seat. As is proved before.

II. "It is a Humane Church as to the constitutive "Head, as distinct from the true Universal Church, "which hath no Head (single or collective, Pope or "Council) that is not God.

III. "It is a Sect consisting of about the third part of "the Christian world, calling themselves the whole "Church, and condemning all the rest for not subjecting "themselves to this Usurping Head.

IV. "It is a new Church in comparison of Christs "Universal Church, as having a new Humane Original. (As is proved.)

V. "It is a treasonable Church, as set up without "Christs Authority, and challenging his Prerogative, "and weakning his Kingdom, by unchurching the great-"est part.

VI. "It is an unholy Church, as distinct from the "holy

" holy Catholick Church, and that both in the essential " Matter and Form. 1. In the Matter, its Head which " is a constitutive part, having been oft a condemned " Heretick, Infidel, Murderer, and other flagitious wick- " ed man. 2. As to the Form, being not of God it is " not holy. 3. Besides that, as to the Head, he was long " made by the most wicked Whores.

All this is before proved at large.

VII. " It is a Church that hath had its pretended suc- " cession interrupted (*as is proved*;) sometimes by long " Vacances, sometimes by long Schismes, when no one " was the Universal Head; sometimes by the Incapacity " of the Persons, being Lay-men, or Infidels, Simoniacal, " condemned deposed Hereticks, and therefore no Bi- " shops.

VIII. " It is a Schismatical Church, that cuts off it self " from all the rest of the *Christian Church*: And by ma- " king a false Head and Principle, and conditions of Uni- " ty, which the *Universal Church* never did, never will, " or can unite in, is the grand cause of the greatest con- " tinued Schism.

IX. " It is a trayterous *Church* against Princes, ma- " king it their very Religion to force bloody Oaths on " them, and to excommunicate and depose them, and " give away their Dominions, and that tolerateth its most " famous Doctors to maintain, that being excommuni- " cate, they are no Kings, and may be killed; and to " maintain, that the Pope is above them in Temporals, " and may set up and pull down Kings when he seeth " cause.

All this is expressly proved before.

X. " It is a *Church* that believeth Contradictions (*as* " *is proved in their Councils*) *e.g.* The *Council* of *Basil*,

" *Seſſ. ult.* ſaying [No one of the skilful did ever doubt,
" but that the Pope was ſubject to the Judgment of a
" *General Council*, in things that concern Faith, *&c.*]
" And others ſaying the clean contrary: As alſo in divers
" other things.

XI. " It was for above forty years, ſometimes two,
" ſometimes three *Churches*, inſtead of one: For the
" Head being an eſſential part, two or three Heads make
" as many Churches.

XII. " It is at this day divers Churches really, as to
" the Form, that are by the ignorant ſuppoſed to be one:
" Two or three Forms and *Partes Imperantes*, being eſſen-
" tial, make as many Churches, though the ſubjects live
" mixt. The *ſumma Poteſtas* is a conſtitutive eſſential
" part. Some called Papiſts take the Pope for the *ſumma*
" *Poteſtas*, and ſome a *Council*, and ſome both conjunct,
" and ſome the Church real or diffuſed through the
" World.

XIII. " It is a Church made up of a tolerated hodge-
" podge of many Sects, ſome utterly uncapable Members,
" ſo they do but ſerve the Pope.

I have ſhewed out of many Doctors cited by *Sancta Clara* that many that believe not in Chriſt are of their Church. He ſaith himſelf pag. 113. (*Deus, Nat. Grat.*) [" What is clearer than that at this Day, the Goſpel
" bindeth not, where it is not authentically preached;
" that is, that at this Day men may be ſaved without an
" explicite belief of Chriſt? For in that ſence ſpeaks
" the Doctor concerning the Jews: And verily what e-
" ver my illuſtrious Maſter hold, with his learned Ma-
" ſter *Herera*, I think that this was the Opinion of *Scotus*,
" and the COMMON one, *citing* many that fol-
" low it.

And

And that men that hold all the different Opinions in the *Jesuites Morals*, and the Schoolmen, besides many various Religious Sects, make up their Church, is not denyed.

XIV. "It is a *Church* that pretendeth to have a Judge "and end of Controversies; but indeed hath a Judge "that for the most part dare not decide them, and that "can make no end of them when decided.

For instance, the Controversie of the Virgins immaculate conception decided at *Basil*, is never the nearer an end. Images were decreed up by some *Councils*, and down by others. Even S. *Thomas* stood not to the second *Council* of *Nice* about Image Worship. The various *Councils* that decreed variously for and against a *Councils Supremacy*, never the more ended the strife.

And indeed it is so hard to know *approved* from *reprobate Councils*, and *what parts* of them the Pope meant to approve, and what not, (as by Pope *Martin* 5. his *Conciliariter* appeareth) that there is no certainty, and no end.

XV. "It is a *Church* that hath almost laid by the ancient Discipline of Christs appointment, and instead of "it hath set up partly Auricular Confession, when it "should be Publick, and partly a tyrannical sort of ho-"stile proclaiming their Adversaries excommunicate "without hearing them, and forbidding Gods Word and "Worship to whole Kingdoms.

Saith Learned *Albaspineus* a Bishop, *Observ.* 1. *pag.* 1. [*If ever any one in this Age was deprived of Communion (which I know not whether it ever fell out) it was only from the receiving of the Eucharist: In the other parts of his life he retained the same familiarity and converse with other Believers, which he had before he was excommuni-*[*cated.*

XVI. "It is a *Church* that is upheld by Flames and "Blood, distrusting the ancient Discipline, and the meer "Protection of the Magistrate, and the proper work of "his Office.

The foresaid 12. General Council at *Laterane* proveth it, besides Inquisitions and bloody Executions.

XVII. "It is a *Church* that cherisheth ignorance in the "matters of Salvation.

Proved, 1. By forbidding the reading of the Scriptures translated, without Licence. 2. Their Prayers in an unknown Tongue. 3. The quality of their commoneſt Members.

XVIII. "It is a *Church* that militateth against Christi-"an Love. 1. By their foresaid condemning the most of Christians. 2. By the foresaid bloody Religion and Execution.

XIX. "It is a *Church* which hath often damned it self, "one Pope and Council damning others. *As is proved.*

XX. "It is a *Church* which indeed is no *Church*, ac-"cording to their own Rules; the Pope indeed being no "Pope, and the General Councils no General Councils, "(*as is proved.*) And if it were one, it could not possibly "be certainly known to be so; because the Pope, who "is an essentiating part, cannot be certainly known. As is proved both as to Election, Ordination, and all that is necessary to a Right and Title.

As to the Doctrines which they hold contrary to the Scriptures, I have named many of them elsewhere, (in my *Key, pag.* 39. 142, 143, *&c.*) And others more largely.

And thus I have told you what I take a *Pope*, a *Papist* and the *Papal Church to be*. But you must remember that as the same man may be a visible Christian or Member

of

of the true Universal Church as headed by Christ, and a visible Papist or Member of the Sectarian Church as headed by the Pope, so I judge none of you as in the first respect, but allow you the same Charity proportionably as I do other erring Sects: And especially to those many thousands who adhere to a Church which they understand not, and profess that in gross which in particulars they themselves abhor: Of which number I am not hopeless your self (*W. H.*) to be one.

CHAP. IX.

How our Religion differeth from the Papists.

AND now out of all this it is easie for you to gather how our Religion differeth from the Papists: I shall recite but a few of the Differences, leaving you to collect the rest from what is said of theirs.

I. *Our Religion is wholly Divine, or made by God:* For so is the holy Scripture, which is all ours. *But the Papists superadditions are made by men:* Even Popes and Councils, under pretence of Declaring, Expounding, Governing, Judging, *&c.*

II. " The Religion of Protestants is no bigger, nor no " other in the Essentials, than the Sacramental Covenant " with God the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, expoun- " ded in the Creed, Lords Prayer, and Decalogue; And " in the Integrals no bigger, nor other, than the holy Ca- " nonical Scriptures. But the Papists is as big as all the " Decrees of all General Councils, added to all the Bible; " if not the Popes Decretals also, and uncertain Tra- " ditions.

Tell us not of our 39 Articles, and other Church Confessions, as contrary to this: For those Confessions all profess what I here say: And you may as well tell us of our other Books and Sermons. Our question is not of mens *Subjective Religion*; For so each person hath one of his own; And it cannot be known but by knowing what is in each mans mind! And our Books and Confessions are (as is aforesaid) but the Expression of our sense of that which is our *Regular Objective Religion*: And we are ready to confess and amend any misconception: but our *Objective Religion* which is the *Rule* and *Law* of our *Faith* is only Divine.

III. "Our Religion is known, even the Sacred Bible. "But yours is unknown: what are approved Councils, "and what decrees are intended to be *de fide*, and what "temporal, and what perpetual, and how far the Popes "Decretals bind, and whether all *Isidore Mercator*'s De"cretals be the Popes, with abundance of the like.

IV. "Our Religion is owned by you, and every word "confessed to be Divine and Infallible: But your added "Popery is disowned by us as sinful, presumptuous and "false.

V. "Our Religion is fixed and unchangeable; (for so you confess the holy Scriptures to be:) "But yours is still "swelling bigger and bigger while Councils will increase "it, and hath no certain bounds.

VI. "Our Religion is only that ancient one delivered "by the Holy Ghost in the Apostles, and so is certainly "Apostolical, your additions are Novelties since brought "in.

VII. "Our Religion is Infallible, Holy, Pure, your "additions are fallible, contradictory, sinful, oft contrary "to plain Scripture, condemning one another.

VIII. "Our

VIII. "Our Religion is Universal, owned by all the "Christian World in the Essentials, and in the Main in "the Integrals, that is, the Scripture: Greeks, Papists, Armenians, Abassines, and all other parties that are Christians own it. "But your additions are some disowned "by one part of Christians, and some by another, and "some by all save your selves.

IX. "Our Religion therefore is the true terms of Ca-"tholick concord, according to *Vincent. Lerinens. Doctrine, quod ab omnibus, semper, ubique receptum est.* "But your additions are the very Engine of the dividing "Enemy, by which he hath long kept the Christian "World, distracted by discord, with all the calamitous "effects and consequents."

X. "Our Religion hath a certain Rule for the ending "of all controversies, so far as there is hope of ending "them in this world: All men will rest in the Judgment of God; and his word in all such necessary things is plainer than all your General Councils: But your Humane Authority is such as fighteth with it self and all the world, and which the Universal Church never yet received nor will ever rest in.

XI. "Our Religion owneth a certain lawful Govern-"ment appointed by God, which well used may keep "just order in the world: That is, Parents in Families, "Pastors in such particular Churches as Christ hath in-"stituted, (as join for personal Communion in holy Doctrine, Worship and Conversation;) which they are indeed capable of Overseeing and Governing by Sacred Doctrine in Christs way: And Associations or Correspondencies of these Pastors for concord; "And Prin-"ces and Magistrates to keep peace and order among "them all; Governing Clergie-men as they do Philo-

sophers,

ſophers, Phyſicians, *&c.* But yours hath an *Utopian* pretended Government of men on the other ſide the world, whoſe Countries you ſcarce ever heard or dreamed of; and an Uſurpation of an impoſſible confounding kind and degree of Rule.

XII. "Our Religion is fitted to give Glory to Chriſt, "and his Grace and Kingdom. But yours to ſet up "Proud Uſurpers over Princes and People, in ſuch an "impoſſible Government making Subjection to him, ne-"ceſſary to ſalvation. As if a man unacquainted with Coſmography that never heard that there was ſuch a Town as *Rome* in the world, muſt be no Chriſtian and be damned: when yet the Popes name was never mentioned in our Baptiſm.

XIII. "Our Religion is Faith working by Love. "Chriſts Miniſters that are truly of our Religion, take "only convincing evidence of Truth, and unfeigned "love, and works of love, to be their means of winning "Souls: And they take not Chriſts Diſcipline, which "worketh only on the conſcience, to be a leaden Sword, "or vain. But yours is a hanging killing Religi-"on; Jails, Strappado's, Exterminating, and Burning "men are your means and works of love. You take a Bonfire, or the Aſhes of the Bodies of ſuch as will not believe in the Pope, to be a great Medicine to ſave the peoples Souls. Such Murders as were done on the *Albigenſes*, *Waldenſes*, in the Inquiſitions, the *French* and *Iriſh* Maſſacres, *Smithfield* Flames, *Piedmont*, *&c.* are your proof that you love God and Man, and ſome of your *good works*.

XIV. "Our Religion tendeth to holy conſolation, and "a heavenly mind and life: For it teacheth us how to be "certain of Gods love by its effects on our Souls, and to

"know

"know that we are justified by Christ, and to trust the "sufficiency of his Sacrifice, Merits, and Intercession; "and to believe, that when we are absent from the body "we shall be present with the Lord, 2 *Cor.* 5. 1. 7, 8. and "to desire to depart and be with Christ, *Phil.* 1. 23. But yours leaveth a man uncertain of his Justification: For you mostly deride such distinguished Fundamentals, as (received) essentiate a justified Christian: And your Doctors lay all mens necessary Religion, and so their Peace, upon their *receipt of so much truth as hath been authentically proposed to them*; whereas no man living is certain that he hath received so much as hath been so proposed: All men are guilty of neglecting some such Proposal at one time or other: And gradual neglects the best are guilty of. And you cannot ascertain men what is an authentick Proposal. You also tell men of the necessity of their own *satisfactions* for the sin that Christ forgiveth, and that in the Fire of Purgatory; so that (as is said before) none such can dye comfortably, that look to go hence into such a Fire, where torment may make it hard to you to love God that tormenteth you. It is a spirit of bondage that seemeth to actuate your very austerities, and to turn your Religion into superstitious tasks of self-made Services; Ceremonies, and expectations of the expiating Flames in Purgatory: But you shew too little of the *Spirit of adoption, of power, love and a sound mind*, 2 *Tim.* 1. 7. of *righteousness, peace and joy in the Holy Ghost*, *Rom.* 14. *Terrour* and *Torments* are temptations to you to desire the miserablest life on Earth (much more a life of pleasure) rather than to dye, when such Flames must next follow.

XV. "We offer God such Worship as we can prove "by his Word that he commandeth and accepteth; and

"such

" such reasonable service in spirit and truth, which is not " unsuitable to the Father of Spirits, and God of wisdom; " yet using all reverent and decent behaviour of the bo- " dy as well as of the mind. But it would be hard to number over all the Humane inventions of *Formalities*, and *Rites*, and *Ceremonies*, and *Images*, and other arbitrary external things, by which you have corrupted the Worship of God, and hid the body in your new fashioned Cloathing, which you pretended to adorn; And as worldly minds do cumber themselves, as *Martha*, with many unnecessary things, and then say, [*Is it not lawful to do this and that?*] while they hereby alienate the *thoughts*, *affections*, *and time*, which should be laid out on the *one thing needful*; so do you in Gods Worship make such abundance of work with your Ceremonies, for *thoughts*, *affections*, and *time*, as maketh it very difficult to give the great and spiritual part of Worship its proportion, (far beyond what *Augustine Epist. ad Januar.* so much complained of in his time:) and then think you justifie all, if you can say, *How prove you this or that unlawful?* As if your Servant should instead of his work play at Cards most of the day, and ask you [*How you prove it unlawful?*] You never well studyed 2 *Cor.* 11. 3. [*I fear lest by any means as the Serpent beguiled Eve through his subtilty, so your minds should be corrupted from the simplicity that is in Christ,*] nor *Col.* 2. 18, 19, 20. 22, 23. nor *Act.* 15. 28. nor *Rom.* 14 and 15. nor *Joh.* 4. 20, 21. An ignorant Woman set upon Christ, just as you pervert all holy discourse, with turning all to [*which is the true Church?*] *Our Fathers Worshipped in this Mountain, and ye say that in Jerusalem is the place where men should Worship:* But Christ answereth you in her, *The true Worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth: For the*

Father

Father ſeeketh ſuch to worſhip him: God is a Spirit, &c.] Thoſe that by Cuſtom be not ingaged in your way of numerous Formalities and bodily actions, can hardly think that you are ſpiritually and ſeriouſly worſhipping God, or can believe that Infinite Wiſdom would be pleaſed with ſuch things as —— I am loth to denominate or deſcribe.

XVI. "Our Religion teacheth us that without Holi-"neſs none ſhall ſee God, and none but the Pure in "Heart and Life are bleſſed, and if any man have not the "ſanctifying ſpirit of Chriſt he is none of his: and that "God muſt be loved above all, and our treaſure, heart "and converſation muſt be in Heaven, and none but "Saints are ſaved. I think you deny none of this; And yet you Canonize a Saint as if he were a wonder or rarity, and you call a few ſequeſtred Votaries *Religious*, as if all that will be ſaved muſt not be *religious*. And your Doctors are permitted to teach all that's cited in the *Jeſuites Morals*, and Mr. *Clarkſon* fore-cited: Even that it is not *commanded*, that *God be intenſively loved above all. Tolet. li.* 4. *de Inſtruct. Sacerdot. c.* 9. ſee our *Morton Apolog. part* 1. *l.* 2. *c.* 13. *Stapleton l.* 6. *de Juſtif. c.* 10. *& Valent. l. de Votis c.* 3. [*This Precept of loving God with all the mind, is doctrinal, not obligatory,*] ſee my *Key*, *chap.* 33, 34. 38.

And yet you have the Fronts to perſwade men that we are for only *Imputative Holineſs*, and againſt *good works*.

XVII. "Our Religion is for increaſing true practical "knowledge in all men, by all our induſtry, as know-"ing the Father of Lights ſaveth us by illumination; "and therefore we are for all mens reading or hearing the "holy Scriptures, and worſhipping God in a known "tongue: But yet with the help of the skilfulleſt Teach-

" ers. The Prince of darkneſs leadeth men in the dark to do the works of darkneſs, that they may be caſt into outer darkneſs. How the caſe is with yours I have before ſhewed.

XVIII. " Our Religion is for ſo much faſting and au-" ſterities as is truly neceſſary to the ſubduing of Pride, " Worldlineſs, or fleſhly luſts, or to expreſs our ſelf-abaſe-" ment in due times of humiliation, (*preſcribed by Au-" thority on publick occaſions, or diſcerned by our ſelves in " private*;) and ſo much as is truly helpful to us in Gods " ſervice, or our preparations for death. But how much you have turned theſe into unreaſonable Ceremony, and how much into a pretended ſatisfaction to Gods Juſtice by puniſhing our ſelves, as if our hurt delighted God when it tends not to our healing, I ſhall not now ſtay to open. See *Dallæus de Pœnis, Indulgentis, & de Jejuniis*, of it at large.

XIX. " Our Religion teacheth us that all that truly " believe in, and are heartily devoted to God the Father, " Son, and Holy Ghoſt, as their God, and Saviour, and " Sanctifier, forſaking the Devil, the World, and the " Fleſh, ſhould be taken by Baptiſmal profeſſion hereof " into the Church, and ſhall be ſaved, if they prove not " Hypocrites or Apoſtates: And that we muſt judge men " by this their Profeſſion, till they plainly or provedly " nullifie it, ſuppoſing every man, under God, to be the " beſt Judge of his own heart.

But your Religion teacheth you to hold and ſay, that if men are never ſo fully perſwaded in themſelves that they truly love God and holineſs, and are thus devoted to him, yea and if their lives expreſs it, yet if they be not Papiſts, they are all deceived, and none but Papiſts

ſo

so love God: And every Papist thus knoweth the hearts of others, better than we can know our own.

XX. "Our Religion leaveth us room for Repentance, "and hope of Pardon, if we mistake. For we take not our selves to be impeccable or infallible in all that we hold; though we are sure that our *Rule* and *Objective* Religion is infallible. But your Church being founded in the false conceit of the Popes and Councils Infallibility, you shut the door against repentance and amendment; and when once a false Decree is past, you take your selves obliged to defend it, lest by Reformation you pluck up your Foundation, and all should fall. Were it not for this I am perswaded your Church would recant at least the Doctrine of Transubstantiation, if not that of deposing Princes, and some others.

And now I humbly present what I have written to *W. H.* and not without hope (if he will but impartially read it) of his reduction: For the man seemeth to me to sin through Ignorance, and to have an honester zeal than many others. For my own part, 1. I profess to him I write as I think; and that after forty years reading I think as many of the Papists Books as of the Protestants. 2. And that I would joyfully recant, whatever it cost me, if I could find that I do erre. But I have shewed him that I differ not from them, without that which to me appeareth to be constraining Reason. 3. And that if he will prove to me that I have in one word of this Book unjustly accused, either their POPE, PAPISTS, RELIGION, or CHURCH, I shall thankfully receive his conviction, and repent.

And

And I agree with him wholly in professing my Religion to be, The APOSTOLICAL CHRISTIANITY, and whatever he proveth to be truly such I will receive. The Name of [*The Protestant Religion*] I like not, because meer *Christianity* is all our *Religion*, and our *Protestation* against Popery denominateth not our Religion it self, but our Rejection of their Corruptions of it. But the Name of [*The Protestants Religion*] I approve and own, that is, APOSTOLICK CHRISTIANITY CLEANSED FROM POPERY.

Aug. 9. 1676.

FINIS.

THE

CONTENTS.

CHAP. I.

WHether Christ hath not left us sure and easie notice what the Christian Religion is: what it is, and how delivered to us, in three degrees. 1. *The Essentials generally in the Sacramental Covenant.* 2. *The Exposition of the Essentials in three summaries, the Creed, Lords Prayer and Decalogue.* 3. *The Essentials, Integrals and needful Accidentals in the whole Canonical Scripture.* p. 1, &c.

Our Confession, Articles, Books, and Sermons are but the expressions of our Subjective Religion, or fides mensurata, *and are not our Objective and* fides mensurans in terminis. p. 9.

The Papists confess every word of our Objective Religion to be Divine and Infallible. But we confess not the truth of all theirs. *They blame us only,* 1. *As not having enough.* 2. *And as not receiving it the right way.* p. 9.

I. *whether the Papists Religion be better than ours, as bigger? Some Queries of the Antiquity of the belief of the Roman additions, viz. the Apocrypha and the Decrees of all the Councils,* &c. p. 10, &c. *What Implicite Faith we are*

agreed in, and what not. p. 12. *The Papists confess that their Church hath not kept God's own written word without many hundred errours, and so not all that is* de fide. p. 13. *Therefore they must needs distinguish the* Essentials *of Christianity from other points.*

Of Implicite belief in the Pope and Councils. p. 13. &c.

II. *Whether it was or is necessary to receive Christianity as from the Infallibility or Authority of the Pope and Papists (or Councils)* p. 19. &c. *We have much more and surer* Tradition *for our Religion than that which the Papists would have us trust to.* 20. *The difference of our Tradition from theirs. Whether* Rome *or a Church there may not cease.* p. 22. *Whether the* Seat, *the* Election, *or what doth prove the Pope to be St.* Peter's *successour.* p. 23. *Whether Books or oral Tradition by Memory of all Generations, be the surer preservative of the Faith.* p. 24.

CHAP. II.

THe Puritane is ambiguously named, and falsly described. p. 25.

Of Imputed Righteousness. p. 30. *Puritanes not against external worship, nor all Ceremonies.* p. 36. *Of their Usage.* ibid.

The Puritans judgment about Fasts, Holy-days, Ceremonies, &c. p. 38. *The Papist writer knoweth not what the Puritans Religion is.* p. 40. *The true Religion of a Puritane described.* p. 41, 42. 1. *The writer wrongeth his Relations.* 2. *He declareth that he was before an ungodly perfidious Hypocrite, and no true Puritane, and therefore no wonder that he turned Papist.* p. 43.

None

None but such can turn Papists without self Contradiction.

His slander of the Puritanes, that they think Piety, Charity, Humility and other Christian Virtues not possible and necessary to salvation. p. 45.

CHAP. III.

His hard Character of Prelatical Protestants. p. 46.

Many Nonconformists are Episcopal; therefore not distinguishable by that name. p. 47.

What men many Bishops and Conformists have been and are in England. p. 48.

The Religion which is uppermost, right or wrong, will be professed usually by the most, and therefore by bad men. p. 49.

It is worse with the Papists, who are many very bad, even where they differ from superiours and suffer. ibid.

His accusations of Puritanes and Prelaticks Protestants about imputed Righteousness and inherent confuted: A true description of the Protestants judgment of justifying Righteousness. p. 51, 52, &c.

His derision of Imputed Righteousness as a Mummery. p. 54, 55. *His gross slander that we are for* [meer Imputed Holiness.] p. 55.

The true middle way about Indifferent Rituals. p. 56.

1. *Of his charge on Prelatists for silencing Puritanes for not observing Fasts,* &c. *which they neglect themselves.* p. 57.

Puritanes and Papists fasting.

2. *Of wax tapers on the Altar.* p. 58.

3. *Of the Sign of the Cross.* p. 58, 59.

4. *Of the real presence.* p. 60.

5. *Of Confession and Absolution.* p. 61.
6. *Of bowing at the* Name Jesus, *and Images.* p. 62.
7. *Of the Surplice, Girdle, Stole, and Casuble.* p. 63.
8. *Of praying for the Dead.* p. 64.
9. *Of the Government of the Pope and Councils.* p. 65.

1. *whether Gods wisdom require it.* 2. *Civil and Ecclesiastick Monarchy of the whole world, Compared.* p. 66,67. 3. *Is the Pope Universal Apostle or Teacher?* p. 55. 4. *Whether the Pope be Head but in the Vacancy of Councils?* p. 66. 5. *Most of the Christian World by far are no Papists.* 68. 6. *The Pope dissenteth from General Councils, and so far from the Universal Church: we own them when he doth not.* 69. 7. *The difference between the Kings Headship and the Popes.* 37. 8. *Puritanes are for the Kings supremacie.* 70. 9. *How far they submit their judgment to the Churches.* p. 70. 10. *The Church teacheth us the Faith, but may not judge* in partem utramlibet, *viz. that there is* no God, no Christ, no Heaven, &c. p. 71.

11. *It's Schismatical and worse to feign that various habite, Gestures, Meats, &c. make various Religions. Q.* 1. *Do variety of Liturgies make various Religions?* 2. *Is not Religion more concerned in the Papists Doctrinal Differences among themselves about Predestination, Grace, Free-will, the immaculate conception and hundreds more in the School Doctors, and about the deposing, excommunicating and killing Kings, and about all the Controversies mentioned by the Jansenists in the Jesuits Morals, and by Mr.* Clarkson *in the* Practical Divinity of the Papists, *than in variety of Clothes, Formes or Ceremonies? And is it not as laudable for Protestants to hold Union and Communion with them that use not the same words or rites, as in the Church*

of Rome *to tolerate without so much as any disowning censure, the foresaid Doctrinal Differences about King killing (when excommunicate) Murder, Adultery, Fornication, Perjury, Lying, Stealing, &c. mentioned in the foresaid Books.* p. 72.

CHAP. IV.

H. W's *ill forming Accusations, which he can best answer.* p. 77. *What* Grotius *meant by Papists.* p. 79.

I. *Of Papists Image-worship.* p. 79.
II. *Of Popes Pardons.* p. 80.
III. *Their praying to the Virgin* Mary. 83.
IV. *Latine prayers.* 84.
V. *Implicite belief in Teachers.* 85.
VI. *Preferring the Churches Laws to Gods.* 87.
VII. *Obedience.* 88.

CHAP. V.

THe *true History of the Papacie, its original and growth.* 94.

1. *The ancient Church took not the Papacie to be of Gods institution, but Mans, fully proved.* p. 99. &c.

2. *The Roman Primacie was ever but one Empire, and not all the Christian People in the world, proved.* p. 103. &c.

3. *Councils were General only as to the Empire, and not the World.* p. 104. *Five exceptions.* p. 106.

Remarks

Remarks upon the Africans pretended ſchiſm (Auſtin *being one.*) p. 112. *The notable words of* Mel. Canus *againſt the Roman Univerſality.* 113.

The means of the Popes laſt growth to maturity. 119.

The doctrines by which they do their work. p. 122.

1. *Depreſſing the Scriptures ſufficiency and crying up their Traditions, which are again confuted.* 123.

2. *Pretending* Antiquity *and* Univerſality. 125. *Both confuted. The objection of Hereſie and Schiſm to other Churches anſwered.* p. 127.

3. *Aggravating our Diviſions and boaſting of their Unity.* p. 128.

Even the ſcandalous contending Sects among Proteſtants have more Unity with each other than the Papiſts, proved.

4. *Their vile Counſel to men to ſuſpect all Religion and ſuſpend it, to make them Papiſts:* Boverius *to our late King.* p. 131.

CHAP. VI.

WHat *the Pope is in forty Characters, or inadequate conceptions of him.* p. 134. &c.

CHAP. VII.

WHat *a Papiſt is. The word* [PAPIST] *is equivocal. Many ſorts are called Papiſts that differ both in the* Foundation *and the very* Form *and the* Subject *and the* Terminus *of* Church Power, *and are not formally one Church as is commonly thought.* pag. 165.

A PAPIST *of the moſt learned ſort deſcribed, who placeth*

placeth the Authority Universal *and the Infallibility in the Pope and Council agreeing: Thirty Properties or Characters of them. The first about the Resolution of their Faith into the Authority or Infallibility of the Church proposing. How Protestants resolve their Faith, and how they take it from their Teachers.* p. 169. &c.

See the rest.

CHAP. VIII.

WHat *the Papists Church called the Roman Catholick Church is, in twenty Characters.* p. 184.

CHAP. IX.

TWenty *Properties of the Protestant's Religion as it differeth from Popery.* 187.

ERRATA.

PAge 26. line 28. for *Turrian* read *Piſanus.* p. 76. l. 7. for *in* r. *it.* p. 97. l. 21. r. *Presbyters.* p. 93. l. 20. r. *Roman.* p. 94. l. 2. for *or* r. *of.* p. 107. l. 1. for *Gothes* r. *Vandals.* p. 110. l. 4. dele *and.* p. 115. l. 13. for *Com.* r. *Corn.* p. 123. l. 11. r. *Libraries.* p. 156. l. 28. r. *Greatreaks.*

Errata, in *Roman Tradition*, &c.

Page 18. l. 1. for *moſt real* r. *Moral.* p. 20. l. 5. r. *Georgians.* p. 29. l. 16. r. *Sirmium.* p. 37. l. 5. for *ſind* r. *ſaid.*

ROMAN TRADITION EXAMINED,

As it is urged as

INFALLIBLE

AGAINST

All Mens SENSES, REASON, the Holy SCRIPTURE, the TRADITION and Present JUDGMENT of the far greatest part of the Universal Church,

IN THE POINT OF

TRANSUBSTANTIATION.

In Answer to a Book called

A Rational Discourse of Transubstantiation.

Richard Baxter

Printed in the Year, 1676.

Printed in the Year, 1676.

ROMAN TRADITION EXAMINED, &c.

AMong many Books that lately came forth, of somewhat the like tendency, there is one called [*A Rational Discourse concerning Transubstantiation, in a Letter to a Person of Honour, from a Master of Arts of the University of* Cambridge.] Alas, for the unhappiness of those Persons of Honour that have such Teachers and Counsellors as this! *Could* they have no better? or *would* they not? If they chose them their misery is just.

The Title Paraphrased is [*A Rational Discourse against Sense.*] But the strain of this, and abundance Written, by Men of the like ingeny, tell us convincingly, that while they distrust all their Senses, and would have all the World distrust them, and deny them, they are so confident of their *Thinking, Inventing*, and *Talking Faculties*, that they dare set them in Battel against the Senses of all Mankind, and cherish some hopes to get the Victory. And verily, it is a wonderful victory that such Mens Tongues have got already, if all the Princes, Lords, Doctors, and all other People that go for Papists, do really believe Transubstantiation; and if some be not in the right, who think that there is not one hearty and compleat Papist in the World, unless implicite Believers may be called such, who believe as the Church doth, though they know not

what; but that the Masters of the Game are but the Makers or Predicants of a Faith for others, which never was their own, and that they generate but their like, even worldly dissemblers, and convert only Mens Tongues by the power of the Sword, and not their Hearts by all their Oratory. And I must confess, that when I have heard a prophane Swearer, Curser, Railer, Drunkard, Whoremonger, plead for Transubstantiation, I have thought of peaceable *Melancthon*'s words [*You* Italians *maintain that Christ is in the Sacrament, when you believe not that he is in Heaven.*]

But the devout words and confidence of this *Master* of *Arts* maketh me think that he believeth himself, and that dissembling is not the Art that he is Master of; but though he be as he saith [*Non ignara mali*] yet he may be *Ignarus mali*, ignorant of his Error and of the Mischief which he would do. Indeed if Men will needs believe that Night is Day, and Day is Night, we might satisfie our selves with our compassion for their weakness, without any importunate publick contradiction; but our case with such Men as this, is such as prohibiteth such patient silence: For, the same Religion which teacheth them to deny the *Senses* of Mankind, doth teach them to *Exterminate*, *Burn*, *Excommunicate*, and *Damn* all those that will not do as they do, but will believe their Senses; and also to depose those Temporal Lords that will not exterminate such from their Dominions.

Two things yet I must note, that make me doubt whether the Author be so honest in his dealing as I could wish him, and as a Man that talketh of *God* and *Jesus Christ* should be. 1. That he so *blindly*, or *fraudulently* stateth the Question. 2. That he taketh so little notice of the Books and Arguments that are Written against his Cause,

as

as if they needed no Answer, when we suppose that they have put the Error of Transubstantiation so far past all rational doubt, that it is scarce possible for a Man that hath understandingly, and seriously read them, to believe it: It is but lately that a small Book, on that Subject, was published by *R. Baxter*, Dedicated to the Duke of *Lauderdale*, called, [*Full and easie satisfaction, which is the true Religion,*] which all the Papists in the World can never give a rational Answer to; and therefore this Man dare scarce take notice of such, lest it should bring them to the notice of his Reader. But doth he think that we must not know that his Book is Answered before it was Written, because he will take no notice of it? or must we therefore repeat the same things again?

The *Roman* Article of Faith is, that [*There* is a *change made of the whole substance of the Bread into the Body of Christ, and of the whole substance of Wine into his Blood*] so that our Controversie with them hath two parts. 1. Whether after Consecration there be no longer *Bread* or *Wine*? 2. Whether that which was *Bread and Wine* is *then turned into the very Flesh and Blood of Christ*? Now this *Rational Discourser* confoundeth these together, and in his progress dealeth so little with the first part, as if he were afraid that it should be taken notice of.

The Reader must farther note. 1. That it is none of our Controversie [*Whether the whole substance of the Bread and Wine be Relatively changed into the Representative Flesh and Blood of Christ which he once had, and offered in Sacrifice for us on the Cross, as the Lamb of God that taketh away the sins of the World*; For, this is our Doctrine:] But it is, *Whether there be a physical change of the substance of the Bread and Wine into the natural substance*

of

of the Flesh and Blood of Christ which is now glorified.

2. That the Controversie is not at all of the *Real Presence of Christs glorified Body*, whether it be in this or that *place*, or not? but whether the *Bread* and *Wine* be *changed into it*? For, many Protestants (Lutherans, and others) do profess that we have no certain clear Conception of the nature of a glorified Body; and consequently as they cannot judge of the Locality and Presence of a Spirit, so neither of the Locality and Presence of a *Spiritual Body*: They know not whether the now prevailing Phylosophy be not true, that Light is a Body, and Solar Light is the emanant substance of the Sun it self, whose Center is in the Heavens: And if its very substance be so extensive as to fill all the Air betwixt Heaven and Earth, (and more,) and if the Light of an hundred Candles can be all together in one Room, they are uncertain what are the Limits of Christs Spiritual Body, or whether it be either of a more ignoble nature than the Sun, or of less extent: And most of the *Greek* Fathers thought Spiritual Bodies (if not Spirits themselves) were *Fire*. And as our *Sense* or *Reason* cannot tell us whether or no there be now an Angel in this Room, so neither can either of them tell us whether Christs Spiritual Body be here: This therefore they leave to God that knoweth it, and will have to be no no part of the Controversie.

1. For the first part, *whether there be true Bread and Wine after Consecration*, as many others have fully proved the affirmative, so particularly the foresaid Author briefly hath proved it past all rational denyal. 1. From the *Senses of all Mankind*; an Argument fortified by twenty subordinate convincing Arguments against the denyers of Sense; where the Papists Answers are refuted. 2. He hath proved the *Contradictions* of the Doctrine of Tran-

Transubstantiation. 3. He hath shewed that the Doctrine of Transubstantiation asserteth *one and thirty Miracles*, with *twenty miraculous aggravations*; and hath fully proved from Scripture that these Miracles are fictitious. 4. He hath proved from many expres Texts of Scripture, that *it is Bread after the Consecration*. 5. And also that the Scripture it self doth fully teach us to expound *This is my Body*, as we do, and not as the Papists do. 6. He proveth that the very nature of a *Sacrament*, even as *Aquinas* defineth it, is inconsistent with Transubstantiation. 7. And Lastly, he proveth the *Novelty* of your Doctrine, and that the antient Writers were against it; which *Albertinus*, *Pet. Molinæus de Novil. Papismi*, the late *Morning Lectures* of the *Nonconformists* against *Popery*, and many others have proved at large. But these things our *Discourser Rationally dissembleth*, lest if he should answer them it would appear to be no *Rational Discourse*. But let us hear what the Rationality is which he pretendeth to.

His Discourse consisteth of three Assertions, and their pretended Proof, and a short Answer to some Scraps of Objection.

His first Assertion is, that [*It is possible to the Omnipotent Power of God, to change the substance of Bread and Wine into the substance of our blessed Saviour's Body and Blood.*] And he saith, that [*This his Adversaries generally grant.*] And yet, if he know what they say, he knoweth that they maintain that Transubstantiation is a Doctrine of *Contradictions*, and that God cannot make *two Contradictories true*. They easily grant him that God can do every thing which belongeth to *Power* to do: Though we are not fond of his phrase [*Omnipotent Powers*] no more than of [*wise Wisdom*] or [*strong Strength*] or

great

great Greatneſs,] yet taking his *meaning*, we grant that *Omnipotency* is never ſtalled with difficulties: Though God cannot *lye*, nor *cannot hate goodneſs*, nor *love ſin*, nor *make Contradictions true*, that is not for *want of Power*, but becauſe he is perfect: He *cannot* be *ignorant*, or *evil*; and he cannot chuſe but be God.

I ſuppoſe that he taketh not Chriſt's Body, though ſpiritual, to be meerly, or properly *Spirit*, or (as they ſpeak) *immaterial*; and ſo that it is none of his meaning, that God can turn Bread into *immaterial Spirit*; which yet I would not have ſaid that he *cannot* do: But it is turning one *Body* into another which he calleth *Poſſible*. And that God can do this by *Appoſition*, or *Union*, adding one Body to another, I cannot deny: But theſe following Contradictions we take not for Poſſibilities.

1. For *one Body* to be turned into *another pre-exiſtent*, by *appoſition*, (the *Form* of the changed Body ceaſing, but not the Matter;) and yet that the *pre-exiſtent Body* ſhould not be *increaſed* by the appoſition, this is a Contradiction. As in Numbers, for two to be added to ten, and yet the Number be ſtill but ten, is a Contradiction: So for all the Bread that is Conſecrated to loſe only its *Form*, and the *Matter* to be changed into the *Body of Chriſt*, by appoſition, and yet Chriſts Body to be *no bigger*, is a Contradiction; unleſs ſome pre-exiſtent part of Chriſts Body vaniſh, and it be diminiſhed by loſs, as much as it receiveth by appoſition.

You ſay, that *by Concoction we our ſelves turn Bread and Wine into Fleſh and Blood daily*: But note, that the *Form* only of the *Bread and Wine* ceaſeth, and the *Matter* receiveth a new *Form* in us, and by appoſition increaſeth our Fleſh and Blood; and that our bulk increaſeth not alway, is becauſe ſome parts vaniſh, as others are added;

and

and being in a continual Flux or Mutation, we have little, if any, of the same Flesh and Blood this Year, that we had the last, or a few Years ago. And doth Christ's Body thus change, and receive addition and diminution? or, doth it grow bigger at the pleasure of the Priest?

2. If you say that this is not your ordinary belief, but that the *very Matter*, as well as *Form* of the *Bread and Wine* ceaseth; I add, that it is a *Contradiction*, that the very *Matter* should *cease to be*, and yet be *changed into another Body*. The *ceasing* of *Matter* is *Annihilation*: And to say that it is *annihilated*, and yet *changed into another thing*, is a Contradiction: As *Matter* is denominated from the *Form*, when the *Form* ceaseth, the *Matter ceaseth* to be the *Matter* of that Form; but unless annihilated it is still the Matter of *another* Form. For one *Body* to be *annihilated*, and *another* to take its place, is not for the one to be changed into the other. Annihilating and Transubstantiating are Contradictory.

3. It is a Contradiction for Bread and Wine to be turned into Christ's Flesh and Blood, and made his Body, whose Body is not *Flesh*, or *Blood*; unless he have two Bodies, or one consisting of marvelous dissimilar and heterogeneal parts. That Christ's Body in Heaven is not Flesh and Blood at all, must be confest by all true Expositors of 1 Cor. 15. 50. *Flesh and Blood cannot enter into the Kingdom of God.* The Context sheweth that it is not *Sin*, but natural proper *Flesh and Blood* that is there meant: And who will believe that glorified Bodies are *Flesh and Blood*, whoever well considered, 1. *what Flesh and Blood is*, and for what use? 2. In what *Region* glorified Bodies dwell; and that the Inhabitants are every where Connatural to their Region. 3. That the Text saith *They are Spiritual Bodies.*

And if Christ's Body in Heaven be no *Flesh or Blood*, and his Body on Earth *be both*; then either he hath two Bodies, or very heterogeneous parts of one.

4. It is a Contradiction to say that there are *Accidents*, which are not the Accidents of any Substance, (either of Bread, Christ's Body, or any thing else:) For, *Accidentis esse est in esse*, it is relative: The foresaid Author *p. 96.* hath told you, 1. For *Quantity*, a Pound, or Inch of *nothing*; a long, or broad, or thick *nothing*; a Pint, or Quart of *nothing*, are Contradictions. 2. For the Number of Wafers, or Cups of Wine, to put twenty, or forty, or an hundred *nothings*, is a Contradiction. 3. For Figure, a *round*, or *square nothing*, is a Contradiction. 4. A sweet *nothing*; a *sharp*, or *austere nothing*, instead of Wine, is a Contradiction. So an *odoriferous nothing*; a *rough*, or *smooth nothing*; a *red*, or a *white nothing*; a *nothing* seated on the *Altar* more than another place, *&c.* all these are Contradictions.

5. And he hath there shewed you that it is a Contradiction for *nothing* to have *real effects*: for *nothing* really to *nourish*, and become *Flesh and Blood* in him that eateth it: yea, for *nothing* to be eaten; for *nothing* to turn to real *excrements*; for *nothing* to make a Man drunk, as Wine doth: God can do all that are works of Power, but to verifie these Contradictories, is no work of Power.

6. God cannot *lye*, saith the Apostle, and Nature it self; else Faith had no certainty at all, the formal Object failing. To *lye*, is to give *false* deceiving *signs* of the *Matter*, and of the *Authors mind*: And if God's *Natural Revelation* to Sense it self be *false*, yea to *all Mens Senses*; doth not that make a lye as well as a false Word, Propheſie, or Vision? God's *Natural* Revelations are known by all Men certainly to be his own, and so are

not

not the Prophetical: All know that God *made* Mans *Senſe* to be the *Natural perceiver* of *ſenſible Objects*, that as ſenſed, they might be perceived naturally by the Intellect: And ſuppoſing the *Object*, *Senſe*, *Intellect*, *and Medium* duly qualified, if now we be deceived, *Natural Revelation* faileth, or is falſe, and we have no remedy: So that to make God's Natural Revelation to Senſe, and by Senſe to the Intellect, to be falſe to all the ſound Senſes in the World, is to make God, blaſphemouſly, the greateſt Lyar in the World; and this God cannot be, becauſe he is God.

And now, I pray you what doth the *Doctrine* of *Rarefaction* and *Condenſation* make againſt any of this that I have ſaid? Apply it to any one of theſe Contradictions, and try whether it will prove them no Contradictions? Though your definitions of them are ridiculous, (*viz.* that *Rareſaction* is a *little Matter* under a *great Quantity*, and *Condenſation* is a *great deal of Matter* under a *little Quantity*; and this you ſay is *the ancient and commonly received Definition*) yet this, were it ſo, is nothing to our buſineſs. Rarefaction maketh the Quantity of Matter *no more*, but only more *diffuſed*, or *extenſive* as to *Space*; and *Space* and *Quantity* are not all one: And *Condenſation* maketh not the Matter to be of *leſs Quantity*, but only to poſſeſs *leſs Space*: You ſhew how great a Philoſopher you are. But doth Rarefaction make *Accidents without a Subject*, or *Effects without a real Cauſe*; or *Matter* to be added to *Matter* without *augmenting* it; or the ſame Matter to be changed into other Matter, and yet ceaſe to be the ſame Matter it was; or any of the reſt.

And what if a Spirit, which is circumſcriptively in no place, may be ſaid to be *definitively*, or *operatively*, in many places at once? Will you ſay the ſame of a Body, and

ſo make *Body* and *Spirit* to be the ſame? A Spirit is *indiviſible*, and ſo is not *Matter*; but yet I make not this the Controverſie. I know not how near Chriſt's Body is to a Spirit, which is called ſpiritual; but if it be material, and yet in many places at once, it muſt be by Parts; one Part in one place, and another part in another place. For a material Body not to poſſeſs its proper place according to its Quantity and Parts, is a Contradiction: And whatever you will ſay of Chriſt's *Heavenly Body*, ſure you will not ſay that his ſuppoſed *Fleſh and Blood* is not material, or a true Body: And therefore either Chriſt hath as *many Bodies*, or elſe as many *Pieces*, or *Parts* of *one Body*, as there are Conſecrated pieces of Bread, perhaps many Thouſand Miles diſtant from each other. Yet I will confeſs to you, that as if a Thouſand viſible Apples could grow on one ſpiritual, or invifible Tree, they would be all Parts of that one Tree; ſo if you could prove, that a Thouſand material viſible Hoſts are united by appoſition to one ſpiritual inviſible Body of Chriſt as *Parts*, they would all be *Parts* of that *one Body*; but marvelouſly heterogeneal. But what's all this to the foreſaid *Contradictions*?

But you have recourſe to the Miracle of Chriſt's *Incarnation*, to ſalve the Objection fetcht from *Senſe:* But what mean you by that? Did you think that it is *Miracles* that we object againſt? or that every *Miracle* is a *Contradiction*, or contrary to well-qualified Senſe? What is there in Chriſt's Incarnation, Conception, or Birth, which is a *Contradiction*, or againſt *Senſe*, or *Reaſon*? There is *indeed* much that is *above* the reach of Reaſon without Revelation; but nothing that is *againſt Senſe*, or *informed Reaſon:* For, what ſhould it be? Is it impoſſible for God to impregnate a Virgin, any more than to

make

make *Eve*? Or is it impossible for God to take a humane Nature into Union with the Divine; when as all things are so neerly dependant on him, that he is, as they say, *intimior intimo nostro*? and it is harder to confute that Platonist, who taketh God to be the Soul of the Universe, and all things to be as it were his Body and Accidents, than to prove it impossible for him to be united to *one*. What else meant your Fanaticks, *Fryar Benedict. Angl. in Regula perfect.* to make it Mans perfection to believe that *there is nothing* but God?

And for the Doctrine of the Trinity, it is no more a Contradiction, than to hold that the *Mental Nature* or *Spirit* is informed by a *Vertue* or *Faculty*, which is *One essentially*, and *Three respectively*, as to the *Acts* and *Objects*, *viz.* The *Facultas-vitalis-activa*, *Intellectiva & Volitiva*; or, that the *sensitive* Soul hath a formal Faculty, which is *One and Three*, *viz. Activa*, *Perceptiva*, *Appetitiva*; or, that Fire hath a Trin-une power, *Motive*, *Illuminative*, *& Calefactive*. When *Trinity in Unity* is imprinted on all Active Natures, will you find out a Contradiction in it? If it were *Three Essences*, and yet *but One Essence*; or *Three Persons*, and yet *but One Person*, in the same sense and respect, it were a Contradiction. And is here any deception of our well disposed *Senses*, or any Lye? Because God hath many Works which surpass the power of natural second Causes, in their ordinary way of working; and because he hath many which we cannot know without supernatural Revelation, will you thence infer that he may be the great Deceiver of the World, and may deliver Contradictions as his Truth? As if *Miracles* were all *Lyes* and *Contradictions*.

You say that *Christ appeared to S.* Mary *in the shape of a Gardner.*

Gardner. And what of that? Either *distance*, or want of *light*, or *observation* did hinder her from discerning his proper Visage, and then its nothing to our Case; or else he really *assumed a Visage* different from that which she had formerly seen: And if so, here was no deception of Sense, any more than in the apparition of an Angel; nor no more than a Masked person doth deceive anothers Sense, because he would not be known; nor any more than when one knoweth not his old Friend, when Age or Sickness hath changed him.

Pag. 4. You did with a necessary craft pass over your *Doctors Explications* of the Mystery, as knowing that they do but detect the Contradictions.

You here tell us of [*some of the learnedest of the English Clergie* (or *Church*) *that confess the holy Eucharist, after Consecration, to be really and truly our Saviours Body, and therefore fall down before it, and adore it; and for this cause disown the New Rubrick of the Common-Prayer Book, which saith, our Lords Body is in Heaven, and not on the Altar. These Doctors will tell you that they acknowledge the thing, only they dare not be so bold as the Romanists to determine the manner. And one of the learnedest of them, Mr.* Thorndike, *asks, why cannot our Saviour appear to us in what shape he pleaseth, in the shape of a Gardner, or if it so please him, in the shape of Bread and Wine?*]

To which I answer, 1. That *New Rubrick* is but the *Old* restored: So you call our *Religion New.* 2. Those may well pass with you for the *most learned*, who please you best, while you confer Degrees. 3. Such as you teach men to refuse Kneeling at the Receiving of the Sacrament, (as one of you that is mentioned in the Life of Bishop *Hall*) by thus perswading men, that the English Clergy believe Transubstantiation, and adore accordingly.

ly. 4. Either you ſpeak *true* or *falſe* of the *learneaeſt of the Engliſh Clergie:* If *falſe*, it is an ill ſhelter for your other Falſhoods: If *true*, what regard ſhould we have of the judgment of ſuch Clergy-men, as declare their *Aſſent and Conſent* to all things *contained* in and *preſcribed* by the *Book of Common-Prayer*, and *Articles of Religion*, and yet *diſown the Rubrick*, and *believe Tranſubſtantiation*, and *adore the Euchariſt as Chriſts Body*? Why do you not call ſuch the *Roman Clergie*, rather than the *Engliſh Clergie*, if they differ from you but only in a want of *boldneſs to determine the manner, while they acknowledge the thing*? What if a Biſhop *Bramhall* will have the Pope to be *Principium Unitatis*, and take *Grotius* to be of the mind of the Church of *England*, (who would have *Rome* to be the Miſtreſs Church, and the Pope the Univerſal Governour, according to the Canons of Councils, even the Council of *Trent*,) muſt we therefore ſtoop to ſuch mens judgment? Or might you not as well tell us, that *Caſſander*, or *Mileterius*, yea or *Bellarmine*, were of your mind? And whats that to us?

Your ſecond Aſſertion is [*If our Saviour would have left us his ſacred Body and Blood, inſtead of all the Sacrifices of Sheep and Oxen, under the Moſaical Diſpenſations, to be offered up by Chriſtian Prieſts, and to be fed upon by the Chriſtian People, it would have been a favour worthy of his exceſſive love to mankind, by reaſon of the innumerable benefits, &c.*

Anſw. 1. If he had only *left us his Body and Blood*, he had not deceived all mens Senſes, nor impoſed any Contradictions on our Faith.

2. If he had done ſo, his choice would have taught us to take it for a benefit, becauſe his Wiſdom is fitteſt to diſcern, and to denominate it.

3. To

3. To leave us that Body which was *true Flesh and Blood*, capable of *breaking*, *shedding*, *pain*, and *death*, is one thing; and to give us his *glorified Body*, is another thing: This is not capable of *breaking*, *shedding*, *pain*, or *death*, being a *spiritual*, *immortal*, *incorruptible Body*. Therefore indeed, the Eucharist is *Christs Body and Blood* representative, but not of such a Body as he hath now glorified, but such as was truly Flesh and Blood, which he once offered; the benefits of which Sacrifice are really given us in and by the Eucharist. But to have left us a Body to be broken and slain, which cannot be slain, and *Flesh and Blood* which is not Flesh and Blood, but spiritual, is a Contradiction. But if Christ have two Bodies, or one consisting of parts spiritual, glorified, and of real Flesh and Blood, then indeed one part of this may be still a Sacrifice.

4. But taking it (as you here do) abstractedly from Gods Will, and as in it self considered; what reason can you give us, why *Christ*'s true offering of himself in Sacrifice once for all, should not be as great a Benefit and Love-Token, as our offering him daily? The holy Scripture (*Heb.* 10. 14. telleth us, that [*by one offering he hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified*] and v. 10, 11, 12. that by the *will of God we are sanctified through the once offering of the Body of Jesus Christ: and every Priest standeth daily ministring, and offering oftentimes the same Sacrifices, which can never take away sins; but this Man after he had offered one Sacrifice for sins, for ever sate down on the right-hand of God.*] But you will tell us what a benefit it would be to offer Christ often? Do you really break, wound, hurt, and kill him in your offering, or do you not? If not, how is it a *Sacrifice*? and how is he the slain Lamb of God that taketh away the

the sins of the World? And what Sacrificing, or satisfactory use can it have, to be offered without breaking, hurt, or death? Is it a *living*, or *dead* Body of Christ that you offer? If a *living Body unhurt*, it is none of the Sacrifice the Scripture mentioneth of Christ: And how is it propitiatory for sin? If it be a *dead Body*, was it ever alive? If not, 'tis not Christ's: If yea, who *killeth him*? And if it be his living, glorified, impassible Body that you offer, how unlike is that to Christ's offering? And why calleth he the *Bread and Wine, his Body and Blood*, which a glorified Body is not? It's most evident that Christ speaketh of his *suffering Body*, and not of his *glorified Body* that cannot suffer: And if so, shall we tell God what a benefit it would be to *us*, if every Priest may become as the *Jews*, the killer of Jesus Christ; that he may break his real Flesh, and let out his real Blood? Christ did not this himself. He consented to be killed, but he killed not himself. And what Man of Sense can doubt but he speaketh of a Representative *Body, and Blood* at his last Supper, when his real Body was not broken, nor slain, nor his Blood, till after; unless Christ had two Bodies, one first killed by himself, and eaten by his Disciples; and the other killed after by the *Jews*.

I marvel whether any Papist believe in his Conscience, that *Peter*, and *John*, and the rest, did believe at that Supper, that they did eat Christ's real Flesh, and drink his Blood? What, they that did not understand before his Resurrection that he was to dye as a Sacrifice for sin, and rise again, though he oft told it them? For so expresly saith the Text, *John* 12. 16. *Luke* 18. 31, 32, 33, 34. and 24. 20, 21. If it had been believed by them, why is there no mention of any of their wonder at such a Mistery, as that their Saviour should at once be in their

Belly, and in their ſight? I can ſcarce believe that Man that ſaith he believeth that they believed that then they did eat Chriſt's very Fleſh and Blood. But perhaps ſome of you will take up a late ſtart Conceit, that Chriſt at his laſt Supper did not *celebrate*, but only *inſtitute* that Sacrament: which I am aſhamed to ſtay to anſwer.

For our parts, we take it for a greater mercy that Chriſt doth reconcile us to God, and put away our ſins, by once offering himſelf in Sacrifice, inſtead of the old Sacrifices that muſt be often repeated, than if he had bid us kill, or break, or offer his real Body and Blood often. And we take it for a greater mercy that we may daily offer this *Repreſentative* Body and Blood, and *Commemorative* Sacramental Sacrifice, than to have broken the real Body of Chriſt our ſelves daily, and ſhed his Blood. But I wonder not that they that can *believe*, or take on them to do it in ſpite of all *Mens Senſes*, can do it alſo in ſpight of *Scripture*, *Reaſon*, *and Conſcience*.

I confeſs there is ſomething in what you ſay, *p.*7. It would have been *an incentive to munificence in adorning Churches with the richeſt Gold and pretious Stones, and whatever elſe that's rare and ſplendid*; and alſo to enrich and magnifie the *Prieſt*, that can inſtrumentally make God of Bread, and Sacrifice him when he hath done; or ſet him on the Altar, or keep him in a Box. But to the entertaining of Chriſt into the heart by Faith and Love, a Repreſentative Sacrifice ſeemeth more meet for us to exerciſe: And Chriſt ſaid to *Thomas, bleſſed are they that have not ſeen, and have believed.*

Your third Aſſertion is, that [*The Bread and Wine in the holy Euchariſt, are by the Omnipotent Power of God actually, and indeed changed into the Body and Blood of our bleſſed Saviour Jeſus Chriſt.*

Anſw.

Anſw. This is to the purpoſe if it be but proved. But, alas, where is the Proof? Why you give us ſuch as you have, and we can expect no better from you. You ſay [*This was the Univerſal Belief of the Chriſtian World in the ninth Century.*] How prove you that? Very eaſily in your own conceit; *viz.* ſay you [*It is evident by the Teſtimony of all the Writings of that Age, and by the Univerſal Teſtimony of the tenth Age; nor do our Adverſaries deny it.*]

Anſw. 1. All theſe three are falſe: Neither all the Writings of the ninth Age, nor the Univerſal Teſtimony of the tenth, ſaith it; and your Adverſaries do deny it.

2. But was there not ſome ſorry neceſſity that put you to begin your Proof ſo low as nine, or ten hundred Years after Chriſt? Methinks you ſhould have feared, leſt this have opened all the deceit.

3. Your Adverſaries challenge you to name one Book that ever ſo much as named Tranſubſtantiation, before one *Stephanus Æduenſis* after the Year 1100, which was neither in the ninth, nor tenth Century, and yet you have not done it to this day; and yet go on to talk at this rate. And they challenge you to name one General Council that ever determined for either *Name* or *Thing*, (that the Bread and Wine are changed into the very Body and Blood of Chriſt, and are no longer true Bread and Wine) before the Council at the *Laterane* in *Rome*, under *Innoc.* 3. *Anno*, 1215. which ſure was neither the ninth, nor tenth Century. Can you give us no earlier proof that ever any Conncil mentioned it (when Councils are your Religion) and yet deceitfully talk with confidence as you do?

4. But ſuppoſe the twelfth Century, or thirteenth, had

been the tenth; let us hear your Inference. You say, [*Then it must necessarily be taught in the first Age by the Apostles, to their first Converts over all the World; and consequently be most certainly true: For it cannot be doubted but that the first Converts did understand what was taught them, believe and esteem it as highly necessary to them and their Children.*] — *Then none can doubt but that they could and would and did teach the very same Doctrine which they so highly esteemed, &c.*

Answ. Thus some over-wise Persons can sit in their Closets, and tell from most real Causes, what, *no doubt*, was done in all Ages of the World: And why can you not as infallibly propheſie from such Causes, what will be done, and so get the reputation of a *wise Man* indeed? As one that would infallibly foretel that his Party should conquer in a certain Battel, because they were Men that loved themselves and their Country, and therefore would not wilfully destroy, or desert both; and therefore would not run away: For they know that more are killed when they flye, than when they stand to it; and if they do not run, the Enemy will, as ordinary Experience sheweth; *ergo* they must needs conquer. But when he was asked why all the same things might not be said of the Enemies, and when he shortly heard, *de facto*, that the Enemy had got the day, his great Argument was unanswerably confuted. But let us come to the tryal.

1. I will better argue from your Medium, against you: The far greatest part of Christians in the World are against Transubstantiation at this day; therefore so were their Fore-fathers, and their Fore-fathers, till you come up to the Apostles.

That it is so at this day requireth no better Proof than to have more knowledge in the state of the World, or more

more honesty in reporting it than you have. *Pag.* 16. you say [*The whole World formerly, in a manner, Pagan, except a handful of* Jews *is now become Christian.*] Reader, Is this Man like to tell you what all the Christian World held, in former Ages, from such a Medium as their latter Belief, that can no better tell what the Christian World is? Look over the Globe, or Map of the World, and let this Man tell you which be the Countries that are Christian; and then take the Measure there of their Proportion your self. Or to save you the labour, read any credible Author that reporteth it. *Brierwood* in his *Enquiries*, one of the best, tells us, after the naming of the several Countries of each Religion, that if you divide the Known World into *Thirty Parts*, nineteen are Pagan Idolaters, six are Mahometans, and five are Christians of all sorts: But this Man is not ashamed to say, that, *except a handful of* Jews, *the whole World in a manner Pagan, is now become Christian.* All the Pagans of *Africa*, and *America*, and *Asia*, and all the *Mahometans* are nothing to him; even five sixth parts of the Known World. And, alas, how little probability is there that the *terræ incognitæ*, the vast unknown Regions, should be Christian: sure if they were governed by the Pope, he would know them. He that can Transubstantiate all the Pagans, and Mahometans on Earth, into Christians; and make Men believe that five parts of six of Mankind are now of a Religion which they partly know not, and partly abhor, may not dispair hence to prove Transubstantiation. But how many of this *sixth part* of the World *are Papists*? A Bishop *Bromhall* saith, that about the fifth part of the Christians of the World are Papists: Others think about a fourth part, not measuring by the largeness of their Dominions (for few in the King of *Spain*'s

West-

west-Indies are Christians) but by the Number of Professors. But the most that ever I knew any understanding impartial reckoner allow them, is to be the third part of Christians; comparing them with the *Abassines*, *Coptics*, *Syrians*, *Armenians*, *Gregorians*, the *Greek-Church*, and *Muscovites*, and all the *Protestants*, *&c.* And when the Empire of *Abassia* was greater by many Kingdoms, and the Kingdom of *Nubia* was not revolted, and many great Countries of the *Greek* Religion were not yet turned Mahometans, the Papists were proportionably much less a part than now. And though most of these will say, as we do, that the Bread and Wine are Christ's Flesh & Blood (not which is *in Glory*, but which *was* Sacrificed for us on Earth) yet few, if any, of all these do hold real Transubstantiation. If he say the contrary of them, Travellers, and Authors enow of their own can confute him: (How shamefully they have changed the *Æthiopick* Liturgie, as to their sense, by the altering of one word Bishop *Usher* hath shewed from the true Copies; and by such tricks they can, by a Printer, make all the World Papists: and I would the Pope had no other sort of Subjects to uphold his Monarchy, than such as are so made.)

I appeal now to any impartial reason, whether I may not better argue against Transubstantiation, because two or three parts of the Christian World are against it, than he can argue for it, because a third or fourth part are now for it, or were so in the twelfth, or the tenth Century.

But perhaps he will say, that *they are of the same Religion that they ever were, but so are not the Protestants.* I answer, 1. The Protestants will not undertake that none of their Ancestors from the beginning were in this, or other points, erroneous: If the Papists will, it is suitable to their other undertakings: But that we are of the same Reli-

Religion which all true Christians were of from the beginning, the *same Baptism*, the *same Creed*, the *same Lords-Prayer* and *Decalogue*, and the same Scriptures, owned, shew: and the Lords-Supper Administred in the same words as Christ and his Apostles and the ancient Churches did. 2. But if the Protestants had not been of the same Faith with their Ancestors, what's that to the rest that are more than all the Papists? It's notable to read in their *Godignus de rebus Abassinorum*, how an old Woman (the Emperors Mother) confuted, or baffled the Learned papist that came with *Oviedo* to pervert them to the Pope, by pleading the Tradition of their Fore-fathers, that had delivered them their Religion, and never told them of the Pope. And how tenacious the *Greeks* are of their Religion as received from their Fathers, their very stiffness against the *Roman* Insertion of [*Filioq*;] into the Creed, sufficiently sheweth. 3. But that really the Papists are Innovators, and have changed the old Religion in this Point, as we have oft fully proved out of Antiquity, so we need no other Proof than the expres words of Scripture; which (to pass by the rest) in one Chapter in the three next Verses 1 *Cor.* 11. 26, 27, 28.) doth three times call it [*Bread*] after Consecration. And I never met with a Writer so impudent as dare deny but their leaving out the Cup to the Laity in the Lords-Supper is a change from the antient Practice of the Church. And yet will this Medium serve our *Rational Discourser*; *The present Church leaveth out the Cup*, ergo so did *their Fore-fathers*, and so did the Apostles? And let him tell me, with the Face of a Man, if he can, whether he think in his Conscience that our Ancestors, or the first Converts of the Apostles, were not more likely to *understand* and *remember whether the Bread* and *Cup* were

were both delivered by the Apoſtles, or the Bread alone, than to *underſtand* and *remember* in what ſenſe it was that the Bread and Wine was called Chriſt's *Body* and *Blood.*

In ſum, 1. We believe that all true Chriſtians have the ſame Religion which was firſt received from the Apoſtles. 2. We are ſure that they kept not all the ſame Purity, and Integrity of that Religion; As ſome fell quite away to Paganiſm, and Mahumataniſm, and ſome to Arrianiſme, and other Hereſies; ſo ſome that fell not ſo far, fell to leſſer Errors. 3. And we do undertake to prove, contrary to this Diſcourſer, that the generality of the Churches for many Ages, and the moſt of the Chriſtian World to this day, held not, and hold not Tranſubſtantiation.

II. I farther uſe his own Argument againſt him; At this day, the greateſt part of the Church, by far, and in the fourth Century, that which they themſelves call the *Univerſal Church*, denyed the *Pope's Primacy* (much more his *Soveraignty*) to be of *Divine Inſtitution*: Therefore ſo did the firſt Converts of the Apoſtles. If the Conſequence be good in your Caſe, it is much more in this. 1. You falſly feign all the Church to have been for Tranſubſtantiation, but I ſhall undeniably prove what I urge them for, as being againſt the Divine Inſtitution of the *Roman* Primacy. 2. And this is a Point likelier to be commonly underſtood and remembred, than the meaning of the words [Body and Blood.] I prove the Antecedent.

1. That moſt Chriſtians now are againſt it, is a matter of Fact commonly known: Two or three parts of the Chriſtian World being no Subjects of the Pope at all, *viz.* Thoſe before mentioned. 2. That in the fourth and fifth Century the Church was of this judgment, appeareth

peareth by the moſt expreſs words of one of the four Great General Councils, even that at *Calcedon*, which ſaith, [*Definitiones ſanctorum Patrum ſequentes ubiq; & Regulam, & que nunc relecta ſunt* 150 *Deo amantiſſimorum Epiſcoporum, qui Congregati ſunt ſub piæ memoriæ Imperatore majore Theodoſio in Regia Civitate Conſtantinop. nova Roma, Cognoſcentes & nos eadem definivimus de privilegio ejuſdem ſanctiſſ. Conſtantinop. Eccleſiæ, novæ Romæ: Etenim ſedi ſenioris Romæ, propter Imperium Civitatis illius, Patres conſequenter privilegia reddiderunt: & eadem intentione promoti* 150 *Deo amantiſſ. Epiſcopi æqua ſanctiſſimæ ſedi novæ Romæ privilegia tribuerunt, rationabiliter judicantes Imperio & ſenatu urbem ornatam æquis ſenioris Regiæ Romæ privilegiis frui.*] that is ["We following "alway the definitions of the holy Fathers and the Ca- "non, and knowing thoſe things which now have been "read of the 150 Biſhops moſt beloved of God, that were "Congregated under the Emperour, of pious memory, "*Theodoſius*, the greater, in the Royal City, *Conſtantino- "ple*, New *Rome*, have our ſelves alſo defined the ſame "things concerning the Priviledges of the ſame moſt ho- "ly Church of *Conſtantinople*, New *Rome*: For, to the "Seat of Old *Rome*, becauſe of the Empire of that City, "the Fathers conſequently gave the Priviledges: And "the 150 Biſhops moſt beloved of God, being moved "with the ſame intention, have given equal Priviledges "to the moſt holy Seat of New *Rome*; reaſonably judg- "ing that the City, adorned with the Empire and Senate, "ſhall enjoy equal Priviledges with Old Regal *Rome*.]

Here you ſee, 1. That two of the four greateſt General Councils concur. 2. That they profeſs herein to follow the old Definitions, and Rule. 3. That they conclude that *Romes* Priviledges were given it by the Fathers.

4. And that becauſe of the Imperial Seat. 5. And therefore they give equal priviledges to *Conſtantinople*.

The Teſtimony is ſuch as nothing but impudent violence can put by: either they ſpeak true, or not: If not, then how come two of the greateſt General Councils ſo quickly to falſifie the Tradition of the Apoſtles? Did they not underſtand what their Fathers had delivered to them? or did they diſeſteem it, or forget it?

If they ſpake truth, (as they did) you ſee that *Rome* hath no priviledges, or primacy, from God's Inſtitution, but (like *Canterbury*) in our Empire by the Princes and Fathers Gift.

Which is ſo ſure, that he muſt put off common Ingenuity, that conſiderately will deny it; having not only this Teſtimony of two Grand Councils, but the continued opinion of all the *Greek-Church*, even before their diviſion from the *Roman*: For, let any Man rationally Anſwer me this Argument. [*The whole* Greek-Church *knew that a Divine Inſtitution was to be preferred before a Humane*: *The whole* Greek-Church *knew that* Conſtantinople *was not by Divine, but by Humane Inſtitution, made Patriarchal or equal with* Rome, *and yet were for its Patriarchate and equality, if not priority*: *Therefore the whole* Greek-Church *judged* Romes *Patriarchate and Primacy to be of Humane, and not of Divine Inſtitution.* I have larglier proved this elſewhere.

III. I give you another Argument with your own Medium. [*The Univerſal Church in the time of the Councils of* Conſtance *and* Baſil, *judged that a Pope might be a wicked Heretick, and as ſuch be depoſed; and that it is* de fide, *that Councils have power ſo to do*: Ergo, *this was the Doctrine of the Apoſtles to their Converts.*] And yet the Councils at the *Laterane* under *Leo* the Tenth, and *Florence*,

rence, determine that the Pope is above a Council. What Self-contradictors now do you make the Apostles to be? How could the Councils of *Basil* and *Constance* believe that Councils are above the Pope, and that he may be a fallible wicked Heretick, unless they had received it down from the Apostles? And how could the Councils at the *Laterane*, and *Florence*, judge the contrary, unless they had received it down from the Apostles? Will neither Reason nor Experience make you ashamed of cheating the World by such silly Inferences?

IV. But yet I will come nearer you: The same General Council at the *Laterane*, *sub Innoc.* 3. which first decreed for the Belief of Transubstantiation, did in the very next Canon and words, decree, That all Temporal Lords should exterminate from their Dominions all such, as Hereticks, that denyed this Transubstantiation; and if they did not exterminate them, should be excommunicate by the Pope; and if yet they did it not, the Pope should depose them,, and absolve their Vassals from their Allegiance, and give their Dominions to another. Now either they had this by Tradition from their Ancestors, and so from the Apostles, or not: If not, why should you dream that the Council had the *second* Canon from the Apostles, and not the *third*? If yea: Then, 1. We see what we must expect from your Religion: The King must exterminate all Protestants (and other Decrees say, *Burn them*) or else be deposed himself. To exterminate us all, will be almost to depose himself. Kind Sir, whither shall we all go? or who shall burn so many? It will be a greater *Incendium* than that of *London*, or *Southwark*: And who shall be the Kings Subjects? Who shall Plant *England* anew? The *French*, *Spaniards*, or *Italians*? But what if in this fortunate Island *they also* should

awaken and turn Proteſtants; muſt the King be to ſeek for new Planters to be his Subjects?

As *Benedictus Spinoſa*, who aſſaulted the Scripture, did at once alſo aſſault all Civil Government; and taught men, that he that could get the Crown had beſt right to it; and that a Man may kill any that ſtand in the way of his deſires, and break any Vows when they are againſt thoſe deſires (which are his Intereſt,) God mercifully ſo ordering it, that he that will depoſe Chriſt, ſhall with him be permitted to depoſe all Kings and Governours; Even ſo God in mercy to preſerve Princes, in their wits, from turning Papiſts, hath permitted the ſame Men that firſt by Council condemned common Senſe, and made God the deceiver of Senſe, and of the World, and new brought Tranſubſtantiation into the Faith, to make a Decree alſo (ſuch as never Turks, or Canniballs made). That all Men that will not renounce all their Senſes (that is, their animality, and their humanity) ſhall be exterminated; and all Princes depoſed that will have ſuch (as renounce not humanity) for their Subjects.

Several things are ſaid to this, by Men that think that, if they do but open their Mouths, and ſpeak, though it be to prove that Murder is Mercy and Piety, they have conquered.

1. Say ſome, *You ſee the King of* France, *and others, do not ſo.* *Anſw.* 1. If *they* may be *good Catholicks* that *rebell* againſt the Pope and a General Council, why may not we? 2. I ſpeak not of what any of *you do*, but what your very *Religion bindeth you to do*: Are not *Councils* your *objective Religion*? By the ſame *Law and Religion* then that Tranſubſtantiation was firſt decreed, if it rule in *England*, we are all in Law exterminated, or dead Men (except the Papiſts) or elſe the King muſt be no King.

Can

Can you ſay in Conſcience that your Anceſtors had this from the Apoſtles? If you will, let Kings, that love your Tradition, take it.

2. But ſome ſay, that theſe were no Decrees of the Council, becauſe they were but propoſed in haſte by Pope *Innoc.* and not paſſed by the Council. This help Biſhop *Tayler*, Biſhop *Gunning*, and Biſhop *Pierſon*, in kindneſs, would give the Papiſts; but unthankful Men will not accept it: And therefore the Anſwerers to Biſhop *Gunning* and Biſhop *Pierſon* prove the contrary, as Mr. *Dodwell* hath unanſwerably done lately at large: And what ever it was in it ſelf, it was a General Council to the Papiſts, and is part of their Religion, who number it with the approved ones. And *Math. Paris* ſaith but this, that [*many Decrees were propoſed*, or *brought in* by the Pope, which *ſome liked, and ſome diſliked*] and yet the Major Vote might paſs them: See alſo *Naucler, Gen.* 41. *an.* 1215. *Godefrid ad an.* 1215. *Platin. in Vit. Innoc.* 3.

3. Others ſay, that theſe were but Decrees of Practice and Diſcipline, and not *de fide*; and therefore the Pope is not here Infallible, nor his Council neither. But Men that will not take a ſound of Words for their Eſtates, Lives, and Souls, may ſoon anſwer this. 1. That though there be many things to be believed, that are not to be *done*; yet there is nothing to be *done* but what we muſt firſt believe that it *may*, or *muſt* be done. When it is ſaid, Thou ſhalt love God and thy Neighbour; it is included, that, Thou muſt believe it thy Duty to love God and thy Neighbour: So he that ſaith [Hereticks ſhall be exterminated, and Temporal Lords that will not do it ſhall be depoſed, and their Dominions given to others] doth include, that [*To do ſo is a Duty, or Lawful at leaſt.*] Sure it is not confeſſedly decreed that the Pope ſhall ſin,

or

or that Temporal Lords ſhall be depoſed by him for any thing but ſin, in their Aſſertion.

2. If you grant that a Pope and General Council are Fallible about Duty and Sin, even in depoſing Princes, and diſſolving their Subjects Oaths of fidelity, how ſhall we know that they are Infallible in matters of Faith? He that is deceived in ſaying, Thou muſt obey the Ten Commandments, may be deceived in ſaying, Thou ſhalt believe the Creed: If we cannot be ſure by the Churches Propoſal that *God is to be loved*; how ſhall we that way be ſure that *he is to be believed, and that the Scripture is his word.* And if the Pope may excommunicate and depoſe Princes, and change Dominions by errour; how can I be ſure that he may not ſay by errour, that this Bread is no Bread, and this Wine is no Wine.

3. Is it only matter of *Faith*, and not matter of *Fact* that you have by ſure Tradition? Is not matter of *Fact* (as Chriſt's Birth, Death, Reſurrection, and Aſcention) alſo matter of Faith? And is not this in queſtion a matter of Fact, *viz.* Whether, *de facto, the Apoſtles told the firſt Converts*, that Bread after Conſecration was no Bread, and that this was the meaning of Chriſt's words [*This is my Body*] which you aſſert? And it's matter of *Practice* that Men muſt receive it in this ſenſe. But if the Council may be deceived in this, and make ſuch Laws for ruining Princes and Nations, which yet they were never taught by their Fore-fathers; why may not the ſame Men ſay [*Bread is no Bread*] without being taught it by their Fore-fathers.

4. Will you give it us under your hand, that this Council and Pope did err in this, and are not to be obeyed, that Princes may have ſo much notice of your truſtineſs? But what Council hath ever ſince *declared* that this

this Pope and Council erred in this; name it me if you can? No, they will be guilty of no such Contradictions as shall signifie repentance and amendment.

5. In the mean time, is not the Pope and his Council by this Decree, *declared Enemies* to all Protestant Princes, and People? What can any proclaimed Hostility do more, than thus by your highest power to Decree Extermination of all the People, and Depostion of their Lords? And is not he to be taken and used as a Publick Professed Enemy, who so professeth himself? Are you not all virtually in continual Arms against us, who make the Decrees of such Councils your Religion?

V. And why might not an *Arrian* have argued as you do, when they had their General Councils, and the *World groaned to find it self turned Arrian*, saith a Father? Might they not at *Ariminum* and *Firmium* have said, *How can we believe it, unless our Fathers had it from the Apostles*? And I suppose you know (else *Sondius* will tell you) that the *Arrians* pretend as confidently to *Tradition* as the Papists do. And your own *Dionys. Petavius* hath cited so great a Number of the antientest Fathers and Writers, who speak words too plainly savouring of, or favouring Arrianism, as will tell any Man that their pretense is not without such a colour of proof, as is as plausible as any you can bring for the Tradition of Transubstantiation at the least.

VI. I pray you tell us which way was Transubstantiation delivered down from the Apostles? By *Writing*, or *without-book*, *by word alone*? If by *Writing*, are not those *Writings* yet extant? And cannot we read them as well as you? You tell us that all the Writings of the ninth, or tenth Age shew it (which is false.) But if the Writings of the first eight hundred years shewed not the

same

ſame thing *to them*, how *did they* know it? If by *bare words*, can you make your ſelf believe that *bare words*, and *Memory*, will as ſurely convey down from Age to Age, the Myſteries of Faith, as *Written Records* will do? Do you not daily find, that if Men are but to repeat a Sermon, yea a few *Sentences*, how apt they are to alter, or omit, or add ſome words which alter the whole ſenſe? I ſeldom hear a Sermon reported, but ſomewhat of it is miſ-reported! yea, we can ſcarce have a matter of Fact reported without great diverſity and miſ-reports; which makes the common reports of Perſons, and Things, in City and Country, to be ſo full of falſhood, and uncertainty. Mens Memories are ſlippery, and the alteration of a word, may make the matter another thing. Send but your Servant to do a meſſage, or buſineſs for you, by bare *word* and *memory*; and at another time Write him down all that he ſhall ſay, or do; and try which way will occaſion more miſtake! Why do you keep your Bonds, Bills, Covenants, Leaſes, Deeds, and Teſtaments in Writing elſe, and do not truſt them to Mens Memories? Why are our Laws Written, and Court Records kept, if Memory will keep them better? Had we no Books, or Records, one Lawyer would ſay one thing, and another, another thing; and there would be nothing but uncertainty and confuſion. Why do ſo many Preachers uſe Sermon Notes? Why do you cauſe all your Maſs, even the *Hoc eſt Corpus meum* to be read out of a Book, and truſt not your Maſs-Prieſts to repeat them by Memory? Beſides, that Men Write more deliberately, and accurately, than uſually they ſpeak; and their ſenſe is eaſilier tryed, and reviewed. Where Mens Life and Death lyeth on it, Phyſicians will hardly truſt their Memories with all their Remedies; nor ſend one to the Apothecaries without

a writ-

a written Bill, leſt the miſtake of a *Word*, or *Doſe*, prove Death.

VII. And I ask you farther, Is all the *reſt of your Religion delivered only, or moſt certainly, by word of Mouth and Memory*, or rather by Books? Are not the *Decrees* of all your approved *General Councils* for *Faith* and *Practice* your *Religion*? And are not theſe *written* in Books? Have *Caranza*, *Crab*, *Surius*, *Nicolinus*, *Binius*, the great and many Volumns of the *French* Edition, and all the reſt, been all written in vain? Do all your Lay-Papiſts, or all your Prieſts, or any of them carry all theſe in their Memories to a word? Or are they there as ſure as in your Books? Doth Verbal Tradition now deliver down your Religion? Nay, do you not Write your very *Confeſſions* and *Creeds*? If all your Books were burnt, would not your Religion be greatly changed, while much of the Decrees of Councils would be forgotten? and O what contention and confuſion about them would there be?

VIII. But if all your Religion was ſo currantly delivered by word of Mouth by Fathers to their Children, what made the ancient Doctors paſs by the ſame things in *their Writings*? when their *Writings* were purpoſely to tell their Readers what was the Chriſtian Religion, and the reaſons of it; would they leave out that in their deliberate Writings, which every Child was taught by his Parents?

IX. But what mean you to talk of *all Parents delivering it to their Children*? Do you mean *all Prieſts*, or *all Laymen*? If *Prieſts had Children*, it's like they were Married; And had you then the Celibate of Prieſts by Tradition from the Apoſtles? If you mean *Lay-men*, would you make Men believe any Story you tell them, contrary to the experienc of their daily Converſe? Do we not ſee

that the far greateſt part of Men, both among Papiſts, Greeks, and Proteſtants, have too little ſenſe, or underſtanding of Religion, to be accurate keepers of the ſenſe of Scripture? Try your own followers in *Ireland*, *Spain*, *Italy*, yea, or *France*, whether the generality of the Common People teach their Children, or underſtand themſelves, what a Sacrament is; though your Induſtry may teach them to Cant out ſuch words as you would have them ſay in oppoſition to the Proteſtants. When we have much ado to get moſt of the Vulgar to endure to be Catechiſed themſelves, and to underſtand the very Creed, and Principles of Chriſtianity; do you ſuppoſe them competent preſervers of the myſterious ſenſe of ſuch words as we are Controverting?

X. And if Tradition without Writing be ſo ſure, how cometh Tradition to be ſo contrary? The Millenaries pretended to Tradition from St. *John*? Moſt of the Writers of the firſt 300 Years ſeem for them. Yet I think you will ſcarce confeſs that this was indeed the Doctrine of any Apoſtles.

XI. How long did the Opinion and Practice of Infants Communion prevail in the Church? Doth it follow therefore that they had it from the Apoſtles? Why then do you diſuſe it?

XII. The Practice of not adoring, kneeling on any Lords-day in the Year, or any Week-day between *Eaſter* and *Whitſontide*, was indeed called the Practice of the Univerſal Church, and an Apoſtolical Tradition; and was Decreed in the firſt General Council at *Nice*, *Can.* 20. If they had not this from the Apoſtles, how prove you that your Tranſubſtantiation is from them? If they had, why have you changed an Apoſtolical Univerſal Practice?

XIII. And

XIII. And if it was the Common Belief of the Church, why did never General Council mention it till 1215 Years after Christ's Birth? Was it becauſe it was commonly known? So were the Articles of Faith which they do mention: And ſure it is the Common Faith which they are to preſerve and deliver. Unleſs they were negligent or forgetful, it was becauſe no ſuch thing was then believed.

XIV. The ancient Churches profeſſed that their Creed contained all the neceſſary Articles of the Chriſtian Faith: And when Hereticks obſcured ſome of them, they put the Expoſition of them into their after Creeds. If Tranſubſtantiation then was a neceſſary Article of Faith, how came it to be left out of all the Creeds?

XV. The ſecond Council at *Nice* held Angels to be Corporeal, and that Images were not to be worſhipped with *Latria*: Yet *Aquinas*, and many others of you, as to the *Image of Chriſt* and the *Croſs*, diſſent from them in the latter; and the generality in the former: Had they theſe then from the Apoſtles, or not?

XVI. Doth one of your General Councils, (*e.g.* that at *Trent*,) ſignifie all the Chriſtian World? 1. When they are oft but a few Men (not fifty ſometimes) and when one County or Dioceſs with us hath more Learned Men. 2. When they are a Faction packt by the Pope, and his Agents. 3. When we know that it is uſually the Pope, Prince, or Arch-Biſhop, or Men of Power, that chuſe the Members, though moſt of the Clergy be oft for others, or have no choice. 4. When all the Papiſts that ſend to your Councils are not paſt the third part of Chriſtians, and the far greateſt part have no Delegates there. 5. When we know that a few Mens Intereſt, and Speeches in ſuch Aſſemblies uſe to carry away the

moſt. 6. When we know that they uſe to differ among themſelves, and ſometime carry a Cauſe but by a few Votes: And how ſhall we be ſure that if ninety ſay one thing, and one hundred ſay the contrary, that the ninety did not as well underſtand the Tradition of their Forefathers as the hundred? 7. And when we know that Men are oft in Council born down by fears, or hopes, or fair words, and repent when they come home, as the *Greeks* did after the Council at *Florence*. 8. Yea, when we know that they ſometime fall into inhumane Fewds, yea, and fight it out to Blood; as the Caſe of *Dioſcorus* againſt *Flavianus* proveth. And is this a certain Tradition of what was delivered by the Apoſtles?

Indeed Baptiſm, the Creed, Lords-Prayer, Decalogue, and the Euchariſt have been delivered down by certain Tradition; But ſo hath not every Controverſie about them, nor in particular, the Doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation.

XVII. Read but *Pet. Molinæus de Novitate Papiſmi*, or but the *Non-conformiſts* late *Morning Lectures* on that Point; and you will ſee how the Papiſts have *innovated in Religion*, and all their Errours proved *Novelties*: And ſhall we think that ſuch *changers* have kept Tranſubſtantiation as from the Apoſtles, that could not keep *one half the Sacrament it ſelf* which they delivered them?

XVIII. How ſhall the ignorant know whether this Man *ſay true*? that moſt Books, and moſt Men were for Tranſubſtantiation in the ninth and tenth Centuries? The time is paſt, and the Men are dead: Muſt he know it by the Books of thoſe Ages, or by the Teſtimony of this Age? If by their Books, 1. How ſhall he that hath read their *Index expurgatorius*, and known their corrupting of Authors, be ſure that thoſe are not corrupted? or

many

many of them as very Forgeries, as *Mercators Decretals*, and abundance of Spurious Writings? So proved by *Cook*, *Blondell*, *Rivet*, *Usher*, and many more. Is it necessary to Salvation that the Vulgar (yea, or the Priests) have so much skill in History as to know which way most Men went for so many Ages past, in the Exposition of such a Text of Scripture? What Man can tell now what mind most of the World are of in several Mysteries, and Controversies between you and us? Who can tell how to take their Votes? Much less can every illiterate Man know what mind most Men were of in former Ages; and least of all to be able critically to judge of the Evidence, and what Authors are spurious and corrupted, and what sound. 2. Nay, who ever put so much Cosmography into the Creed before you, or made it necessary to Salvation, to know that there is such a Place as *Rome* in the World? 3. If Books must decide that Case for the ninth and tenth Century, why not for the former also? And have not we all those Books as well as you? And yet we are confident that they are against you. 4. But if it must be by the Testimony of the present Generation, whose Testimony must it be that must tell us what our Fore-Fathers held? Must it be by the Testimony of a *Council*? 1. There is no General to enquire of, nor hath been long; nor know we whether ever there will be? 2. If it must be by the *last Council*, 1. How shall the Vulgar know that it was a true General Council, any more than that of *Ephes.* 2. *Basil*, *Constance*, *&c.* 2. How know they what they did Decree? They never saw, or heard them. If it must be by the Printed Books, 1. They cannot read them. 2. They know not whether they are forged, or falsified. 3. They know not the meaning of them. If it must be by

Re-

Reports, by *whose* Report? Father *Paul Servita* maketh them a pack of Fellows that abuse the World, under the shew of a General Council: He was a Papist. We cannot look for another Council to tell us what *this* Council said. Must men take the word of *particular men*? Some accuse that Council; some own it: Whom shall we believe? must it be every *single Priest*? Then Father *Paul* must be believed against them: And some that turn from the Pope say more against them than he: And how shall the People know that the Priest saith true? Perhaps he knoweth the Priest to be a common Lyar, or perjured; at least, he knoweth him not to be infallible. If the *Pope* be infallible, none of you saith that *each Priest* is so: And we never saw or heard the Pope. If you say that we must believe the Priests where they all consent: How shall ordinary men know that, who never see a Council, nor *many* of them? If the major Vote must be believed: who shall gather the Votes, and how shall the People know them? In a word, I see no way that you have to give men any assurance what to believe to salvation, (for the generality that cannot travel over the World, nor get skill in History and Cosmography) but only to believe that Priest that speaketh to him; when perhaps he knoweth him to be a man that hath forfeited belief; or at least is neither the Pope, Council, Church, nor pretendeth to infallibility.

But suppose that the person be so learned, as to be versed in the Councils, How shall he know by them what the former Ages held? 1. What Councils be they that he must believe, and how shall he be sure of it? Is it the Councils aforesaid of *Ephes.* 2. *Basil*, *Constance*, and such other? These you reject, and many more. 2. Do any Councils tell him by Decrees, which *former Councils* were

were currant, and which not? Sure they do not; no, not the laſt at *Trent*: So that it is not, *de fide*, with your ſelves, which are the true Councils, and which not. 3. How doth a later Council know which former Councils were true? Not becauſe they find ſo themſelves; for then all would be true: If it be by any Characters, what be they, and why may we not know them? 4. How do Councils know which way moſt Writers went, or what they wrote? As it cannot be expected that the Biſhops that met at *Trent* ſhould remember by Tradition what all the Chriſtians in the world *ſaid or thought* in every Age; ſo neither were all *Writers words* known to them without Book, by verbal Tradition. I pray you tell me truly, whether ever any General Council took that way to prove what *Juſtin*, *Tertullian*, *Cyprian*, *Baſil*, *Gregories*, *Hierom*, *Auguſtine*, *Chryſoſtom*, *&c.* ſaid and held, by ſhewing that they had it by Tradition from other Councils Decrees, or their Fathers telling them ſo, rather than by looking into the Writings of the Authors themſelves? And your own Doctors commonly tell us *what the Fathers held*, by citing the *Fathers words*, and not by telling us, that either Councils, or their Fathers, or Mothers, or Nurſes told them what they ſaid or held, [except in the common Eſſentials of Chriſtianity, the Sacramental Covenant, Creed, Lords-Prayer, Decalogue, and that the Scripture is Gods Word] which all Chriſtians acknowledge are delivered to us, as by two hands, *viz.* by verbal and practical Tradition, and by the Scripture it ſelf.

But if it be the *Preſent Church* real, (that is, the conſent of Chriſtians) which muſt tell us what was held in the former Ages (which for ought I find is it that you flye to;) though the ignorant cannot try this, all knowing

ing men can tell that this way you are utterly condemned: For at this day, as is said before, at least two third parts of the Christian World are against your very Papacy it self; and believe the ancient Churches to have been against it: So that Tradition doth depose the Pope. So that you have no way left, but to say, *It is our own judgment or Tradition alone that we will stand to.*

So much to your dull cheat, about your pretended Universal Tradition.

Pag. 11. You notably say, [*Suppose a Book fully written as to all points to be believed by Christians, by the first Teachers of Christianity: Let them together with this Book give charge to their first Converts, not to add to it, or diminish it, and to believe as in their Consciences they shall think that Book shall teach them. Though Generation after Generation be never so faithful to such a Charge, yet they may in after Ages come to lose or change their Faith, because the Book may seem to one Generation to bear one sense, and to another Generation to bear another*----- As these words, *This is my Body, may seem to one Age to bear this sense, This is the Sign of my Body, &c.*]

1. But you must suppose also, that they that will learn *this Book* must have *Teachers*: Else how will they so much as read it? We are for *Teachers* as well as you, though not for *Judges* that may judge *in partem utramlibet.* The Pastors may teach the People that there is a God, a Christ, a Life to come; but cannot judge that there is *none*. And Teachers make known that same Evidence of Truth to the Learner, by which they received it themselves; but do not say, you must believe that there is a God, a Christ, a Heaven, meerly because we say so.

2. And you must put into your Supposition, that (as is said) the *Essentials* are delivered both ways, by *Writing* and by *word of mouth.*

3. And

3. And now ſuppoſe, that the Apoſtles had put the ſame expoſitory words of [*This is my Body*] into a *Book*, which they ſpake by word of mouth? Had that been the leſs *intelligible* becauſe they were in the Book? Or the harder to be remembred? Or could that Age have delivered to the next any more, as from the Apoſtles, than what they received? And if that be the ſame written as ſpoken, ſure writing maketh it not the leſs or worſe? If it do, all your Religion is in danger, now it is written in your Volumns of Councils. Have you *more* yet thats neceſſary, beſides all thoſe Volumns, which you whiſper or deliver by word of mouth? If not, you profeſs your Religion unſafe, becauſe you have written it.

4. And indeed you here profeſs, that the fidelity of ſucceſſive Generation cannot preſerve Religion, by preſerving and delivering any Books. And if ſo, then your preſervation of Fathers, and written Councils, and Decretals, is no ſufficient Tradition of the ſenſe of [*This is my Body.*] Could you ſhew us your ſenſe in them, it is an inſufficient Tradition; for one may take your Councils in one ſenſe, and another in another.

5. But do you indeed think that any Perſon or Country is ſecured from changing their Religion by your verbal way? Why then did the Reformers when they were of your way forſake it? Why did the *Greek Churches* diſown you? Nay, why did ſo many ancient Churches apoſtatize to Mahometaniſm? Was it for want of Verbal Tradition? Had they not the ſame as you? Sure no Law will ſecure it ſelf from being broken by ſinners, and no Tradition is enough to prevent Apoſtaſie. But why the ſame words ſhould be leſs ſufficient *written* by the Apoſtles, than *ſpoken* by them; or why Gods Writings ſhould not be as ſure and clear in things of neceſſity, as your

Councils; or why your Councils ſhould be inſufficient, becauſe written, no impartial man can tell.

But you ſay further, [*But no ten Families who have been taught by their Parents, either to believe that our Saviours Body is in the Euchariſt, or that it is not there*, (you ſhould have ſaid, *in what ſenſe it is there*) *can poſſibly miſtake, &c.*]

Dreams may ſeem ſomething to men that are aſleep: If God had written the ſame words that my Mother ſpake to me, why could not I have as well underſtood them? Doth my Mother, or Father, or Prieſt ſpeak ſo much more wiſely than God? Sure not, if the words were the ſame. But alas, can you keep us from knowing, that you and we have ten thouſand and ten thouſand Families near together, where the Parents never talk much to their Children about any ſuch matters, nor catechize them, nor themſelves underſtand them: When we ask many of the ignorant Papiſts, whether they believe that there is no true *Bread and Wine* at all after conſecration, they tell us that they do hold that there is, though yet Chriſts Body and Blood be there; which is but the *Lutherans* Conſubſtantiation: And do you not know what *Durandus* taught in this? and yet they that chide him excuſe him from Hereſie. And had *Durandus* never heard what ten Parents teach their Children?

You preſently ſtab your Papacy to the heart, when you ſay [*Seeing God Almighty is reſolved not to teach every Age by immediate infallible Miſſionants from himſelf, but to ſend inſpired Ambaſſadors to one particular generation only, and to leave that generation to teach their Children ſucceſſively till the day of judgement, what they learnt, &c.* Thus much is juſt the Proteſtant Religion. But then what's become of the inſpired Infallibility of your Church? who

though

though they understood not the matter when they came to the Council, (or though the Pope were an unlearned Lad) yet presently can infallibly expound *Scripture*, and deside Controversies. As you praise Mr. *Thorndike*, you might have accepted of the kindness of one Mr. *Warley* of *Cambridge*, in a Book lately dedicated to the Lord Chancellor, called, *The Natural Fanatick*, who will allow the Church and Councils a higher way of certain determination, than by *Reason*; and will tell you how doubtful its left to Reason, whether there be a *God*, or the *Soul be immortal*, and will curb men that will set their Reason against Councils or the Church. But to remember and rehearse only the words that the Apostles delivered, is a work that Reason may perform, without any inspired *infallibility*.

But if Tradition by immediate Parents, yea and Pastors be so sure, the *Abassines*, the *Greeks*, and many others, are sure that the Papacy is an Usurpation: And so were the old *Britains*, and the *Scots*, a little before *Beda*'s time, who would neither conform to the Church of *Rome*, nor so much as eat with them.

Pag. 42. You say [*If God Almighty will oblige me to believe what was taught* 1600 *years before I was born, how should he expect I should come to the knowledge of this, but by such Books as were written in those times, and near those times, and by the testimony of all Christian Countries, what hath been immemorially believed by them, ever since they were Christians.*]

Answ. Well contradicted: This is our very Religion: We stand to *Vincent. Lernens.* Rule, *Quod semper, ubique, ab omnibus.* But, 1. Here then Books be not made so unserviceable as before. 2. God Almighty obligeth us first to believe his *own Book* before any *others*: And

how ſhall we more certainly know what Chriſt did and commanded, than by thoſe that purpoſely Wrote ſo many Goſpels, or Hiſtories of it, that we might believe and have Life by his Name. Sure the four Evangeliſts and the Apoſtles Wrote what they Wrote (even to the ignorant) to be underſtood and read. 3. We alſo know by the Books written near *thoſe times* what then was received by the Churches. And your Councils cannot know it (nor your Pope neither) by any other means than are known to others: for their extraordinary Inſpiration we never ſaw cauſe to believe. 4. And I remember no one thing at all, which I do not receive, *which hath the Teſtimony of all Chriſtian Countries that it hath immemorially been believed by them ever ſince they were Chriſtians*; nor ſhall I reject ſuch when you prove it. But that is, becauſe, *de facto*, I think there is no errour that hath ſuch a kind of Teſtimony; and not becauſe I think it *impoſſible*: For as your part of the World is deceived, *e.g.* to think that the *Roman Supremacy* was inſtituted by God, contrary to the judgment of all the *Greek Church*, and of the two forementioned General Councils at *Conſtantinople* and *Calcedon*; ſo I know not but it had been poſſible to have brought all Countries to the ſame deceit, or to have believed that Chriſt's Blood might be denyed the People in the Sacrament, as a thing received by Tradition.

We believe that the true Church infallibly believeth what ever it believeth upon true Divine Revelation, and that it can never fall from the Eſſentials of Chriſtianity; that is, that Chriſt will ſtill have a true Church in the World till the end. But we know that in many things we offend all, and if every Mans *will* and *Life* is imperfect and culpable, then ſo is every Mans judgment;

and

and there is no Man living without many errours, who hath the Exercise of Reason; and the Church is Composed of such erring Individuals: And why it is not possible for them all to have thought that some of their errours came down from the Apostles (as the *Millinaries* thought) I cannot tell. But whatever is truly proved to be delivered by the Apostles as the Will of Christ, by *Writing*, or *Word*, we will readily receive: And the Essentials of Christianity we believe, and can prove to have been both ways so delivered; and some things more, (as the Lords-day, *&c*).

But you say, *pag.* 15. "*Can any imagine that "they who exposed their Lives for their Religion, would, "if they could, agree together, so notoriously to change it, "as to make themselves most gross Idolaters, by adoring "Bread and Wine, as the true Body and Blood of their Crea-"tor, and God?*] *Answ.* No, but we may well imagine that good Fathers may have bad Children, and that Children are not born with a Church-history, or Councils written in their minds; and that worldly Clergymen may deceive, and be deceived; and that even pious Men might concur in the deceit: that is, That the name of *Christ's Body and Blood* being justly from the beginning applyed to the Eucharist, as the Clergy grew formal, ceremonious, selfish, and worldly, they neglected the explication of the sense and spiritual part of the Sacrament; and grew to over-magnifie the external signs in a way that tended to that advantage and honour to themselves, which for want of Learning and Grace they could not by their worth attain: That the ninth and tenth Ages which you chuse for instance were as a Night of darkness, having few Learned Men, in which he that was but skilled in *Greek* and *Hebrew* was taken

for

for a Conjurer, or a Heretick, other of your own Writers beſides *Bellarmine* do acquaint you. That the Popes were ſome Boys, many Murderers, Simoniſts, and moſt horrid, wicked, and ignorant Men, many by one Woman brought in, and poyſoned after; and that for forty Years there were divers Popes at once contending for their ſeveral Titles, almoſt all Hiſtories agree; That hence the World was filled with Treaſons, Rebellions, Perjuries, and all wickedneſs, how many Hiſtorians teſtifie; when the Pope hath been judged by a Council for a Heretick, and Adulterer, deflowering Women at his Doors. And is it incredible that ſuch Men ſhould degenerate from their Fore-fathers? Or ſhall a Fryar now come out of a Cell, and tell the World, that becauſe the firſt Biſhops of *Rome* were holy Martyrs, it was not poſſible for Pope *John* to be ſuch a blaſphemous filthy Villain; nor for Pope *Eugenius* to be damned as a Heretick and wicked Man by a General Council, and yet continue Pope after depoſition: or for *Sergius* to uſe *Formoſus* as he did? I ſpeak not of rarities, or doubtful things: The Popes greateſt flatterers lament them. *Baronius ad an.* 912 ſaith [" *what* " *then was the Face of the holy* Roman *Church*? *How ex-* " *ceeding filthy, when the moſt potent, and yet the moſt ſor-* " *did Whores did Rule at* Rome? *by whoſe pleaſure Sees* " *were changed, Biſhops were given, and which is a thing* " *horrid to be heard, and not to be ſpoken, their Lovers* " *(or Mates) were thruſt into* Peter's *Chair, being falſe* " *Popes, who are not to be written in the Catalogue of the* " Roman *Popes, but only for the marking out of ſuch* " *times: And what kind of Cardinals, Prieſts and Deacons* " *think you we muſt imagine theſe Monſters did chuſe,* " *when nothing is ſo rooted in Nature, as for every thing* " *to beget his like?*] Is not here a Succeſſion fit to prove

the

the Church of *Rome* to be the true Church? O happy Succeſſion! 2. And is it impoſſible that ſuch Men as theſe ſhould err? and ſuch Biſhops, Prieſts, and Deacons ſhould change one word that was delivered orally from their Fathers? Is not here a ſure Foundation for a Man to build his Faith and Salvation on?

Genebrard another furious Papiſt (*li.* 4. *Sect.* 10.) ſaith [" *In this one thing this Age was unhappy, that for near* " *an hundred and fifty Years, about fifty Popes did wholly* " *fall away from the vertue of their Anceſtors, being ra-* " *ther irregular and Apoſtatical, than Apoſtolical.*] Apoſtates make an Apoſtolical Succeſſion of Infallible wicked Men. Reader, did not our *Rational Diſcourſer* wiſely chuſe the ninth and tenth Ages for his ground-work? Theſe are the very Ages whoſe Teſtimony he appealeth to.

Pope *Adrian* (after) himſelf, (*de Sacram. Confirm. Art.* 4. ſaith, that there have many Popes of *Rome* been Hereticks. And as I ſaid, Pope *John* 13 *alias* 12 was in Council *Convict of Raviſhing Maids, Wives, and Widdows, at the Apoſtolick Doors, and of committing many Murders, and he drank a health to the Devil; and at Dice called for help to* Jupiter *and* Venus, *and at laſt was killed in the Act of Adultery.*

Saith their *Platina* [*He was from his Youth a Man contaminated with all diſhoneſty, and filthineſs; and if he had any time to ſpare from his Luſts, he ſpent it in hunting, and not in praying.* — He ſaith, *he was a moſt wicked man, or rather a Monſter.* — And ſaith, [*that the Life of this wicked Man being judged in a Council of* Italian *Biſhops, for fear of them he fled, and lived like a wild Beaſt in the Woods.*]

Pope *John* 23 was accuſed and depoſed by the General Council at *Conſtance*, upon about ſeventy Articles, which

which you may see in *Binnius* in about thirteen Columns, *viz.* of Murders, Adulteries, Witchcraft, Simony, a Heretick, obstinately maintained that there is no Life after this; called commonly, *The Devil incarnate*; *said the Soul was extinct with the Body, as a Beasts*; *denyed the Resurrection*, &c. And for these the Council deposed him.

So the great Council at *Basil* deposed *Eugenius* the 4th as [*a Rebel against the holy Canons, a notorious disturber and scandalizer of the Peace and Unity of the Church*; *a Simonist*; *a perjured wretch*; *incorigible*; *a Schismatick, and an obstinate Heretick*] Yet is their Churches Succession continued from this condemned Heretick, who staid in spight of the Council that deposed him.

But you'll say, Though the Pope may so erre, yet General Councils cannot. *Answ.* These very Councils that condemned him, are now rejected by you, as is *Ephes.* 2. and many others: yea accused as being another Church; saith the Learned Cardinal *Cajetan* in his Oration at the Council at the *Laterane sub. Leon.* 10. (*Bin. p.* 552.) [*This Novelty of* Pisa (Mark Councils are Novelists) *sprung up at* Constance, *and vanished: At* Basil *it sprung up again, and is exploded. And if you be Men it will now also be repressed as it was under* Eugen. 4. *for it cometh not from Heaven, nor doth it embrace the Principality of that One who is in the Church-Triumphant, and preserveth the Church-Militant*; *and which the Synod of* Pisa *ought to embrace if it came from Heaven, and not as it doth to rely on the Government of a Multitude. The Church of the* Pisans *therefore doth far differ from this Church of Christ: For one is the Church of Believers, the other of Cavillers*; *One of the Houshold of God, the other of the Erroneous: One of Christian-men, the other of such*

as

as fear not to tear the Coat of Christ; and divide the Mystical Members of Christ from his Mystical Body.

See here to what Novelty and Apostacy, even to be *another Church*: You think that General Councils have fallen, as those Councils say the Pope hath done. O but *these Men* can corrupt nothing, because the Martyrs would not have corrupted it! And yet even good Mens pious credulity, believing ignorant Mens Dreams and Visions (such as *Gregories* Dialogues and *Beda* shew to any rational Man) may do much to introduce Changes.

But if Changes be so impossible, because Fore-fathers were pious Men and of another mind, how come the *Greek-Churches* to be Apostatized so far to Mahometanisme? and why do you accuse the Protestants, or *Greeks* of changing, if it was impossible (for ten Families) to do it? Sure then the *Abassines*, *Syrians*, *Armenians*, *Greeks*, *&c.* have their old Faith still unchanged, if it be impossible. Sure never such Villany was charged on their Bishops as on your Popes. If they may change, notwithstanding their Fore-fathers Piety, why not you?

In the last place I should speak to your Testimonies out of some Ancients. But 1. Why should we put it to the tryal of Fathers, when you dare not stand to it, but fly to the Authority and Judgment of your present Church; that is, your Pope. 2. Can any Fathers speak plainer than St. *Paul* himself doth, who calleth it *Bread* after Consecration thrice in the three next Verses? Or did the Fathers contradict him? If they delivered what they received, we see what that was. Is oral Tradition contrary to the Scripture? Is not this a certain Argument? *Paul* in 1 *Cor.* 11. saith oft that it is *Bread after* Consecration; *ergo*, that Speaker, or Writer is deceived, or a

Deceiver, who ſaith, that he or any other Apoſtle delivered the contrary by word of Mouth.

3. Doth this Diſcourſer mean ſincerly in talking of Tradition and the Fathers Teſtimonies, and yet never once attempt any anſwer to all thoſe Teſtimonies to the contrary, out of their plain words, which our Writers have copiouſly and often cited. How many, and many more, plain Teſtimonies of the Fathers againſt Tranſubſtantiation doth one *Edmundus Albertinus* give you? to which, inſtead of anſwers, a few meer words, or cavils are returned: But all theſe are overlooked by this Diſcourſer.

But come, let us briefly try all his great proof of the Tradition of the Fathers.

I. He begins with excellent *Auguſtine* (who in a *Carthage* Council did help to quell the Pope's Uſurpation) And out of many great Volumns he hath found, 1. That *Auſtin* ſaid, that [*now it is no longer called Bread, but the Body of Chriſt:*] The ſame will the Presbyterians ſay: Do they not in their Directory ſay, [*Take, eat, this is the Body of Chriſt*] when they deliver the Sacrament? Are they therefore for Tranſubſtantiation? Is it all one to ſay, [*It is not called Bread, and, It is not Bread?*] *If the King's Statue be made in Marble or Braſs*, you may well ſay, This is not now to be called *Marble* and *Braſs*, but *the King*.

2. That *Auſtin* ſaid [*that Chriſt gave us his very Fleſh to be eaten to our Salvation; but no body eateth that Fleſh, unleſs he have firſt adored it.*] *Anſw.* Any Proteſtant will ſay the ſame. For Chriſt himſelf hath ſaid, *Except ye eat the Fleſh of the Son of Man, and drink his Blood, ye have no life in you.* Do not your own ſacrilegious Popes and Clergy expound this of ſomething elſe than the Euchariſt? when they deny the *Cup* to the People? If it

be

be that *Wine* Consecrated that is here meant, what bloody wretches are you to damn all your Peoples Souls, by denying them all that Blood of Christ, without drinking which they *have no life*? But it's certain by 1 *Cor.*15. that Christ hath not Flesh and Blood in Heaven, and therefore it is not the Heavenly Body, that, as such, is here meant; but the true sense of Christ and *Austin* is, that as the Sacrifices are eaten by such, by, and for whom they are offered; so his Flesh and Blood offered on the Cross is the true Sacrifice for Sin, which must be eaten in its Commemorative Representation orally in the Sacrament, and really in it self by Faith, that the benefits of that Sacrifice may be ours. And who doth not adore that Christ whom we thus eat and live upon? This is the sum of all that the Fathers say.

But let the Reader judge of *Austin's* mind by plainer words, *De Doctr. Christ. cap.* 7. [*Let no Man look to what they are* (mentioning the *Bread* and *Wine*) *but to what they signifie*: *For our Lord was pleased to say, This is my Body when he gave the sign of his Body.*]

And *Cont. Max. l.* 3. *cap.* 22. [*We note in the Sacraments, not what they are, but what they shew*: *For they are signs, which are one thing, and signifie another.*]

And *Epist.* 23. *ad Bonif.* [*If Sacraments had not some likeness* (or resemblance) *to those things whereof they are Sacraments, they could not be Sacraments at all. From this likeness* (or resemblance) *they often take the names of what they represent*: *Therefore as the Sacrament of Christ's Body is in some sort his Body, so the Sacrament of Faith is Faith also.*]

You need no more than this of *Austin* to Interpret other Fathers, that call the Sacrament *Christ's Body.*

II. His next is *Ambrose*, who saith that [*That when Con-*

ſecration hath been made of Bread, it is made the Fleſh of Chriſt] and [*Chriſt makes this Sacrament*] and [*the Body of Chriſt was not before Conſecration, but after*, &c.] *Anſw.* 1. All this the Presbyterians ſay. Even as we ſay, It is not a Law till the King give the *fiat*, or it is not his *Coin* till his Authority and Stamp ſo make it; And are they therefore of your mind? 2. *Ambroſe* expreſly expounds his negation of *ordinary Bread*; no doubt it is not *ordinary Bread*. 3. You would deceive the Reader by hiding *Ambroſe*, who ſaith there, *de Sacram. l.* 4. *c.* 4. [*This we aſſert, how that which is Bread* (mark that) *can yet be the Body of Chriſt*] — [*And if Chriſt's Speech had ſo much that it made that to begin to be which was not; how much more is it operative that the things that were, both Be, and be changed into ſomething elſe* --] And [*As thou haſt drunk the ſimilitude of Death, ſo thou drinkeſt the ſimilitude of precious Blood.*] So *Ambroſe*, and ſo the Proteſtants.

III. His next is *Hierome*; out of many Volumns he hath gathered thus much, that Prieſts [*make the Body of Chriſt with their ſacred Mouth and Prayers.*] *Anſw.* And any Proteſtant will ſay the like: He that ſaith [*This is the Body of Chriſt*] that is, Sacramentally, will ſay that, under Chriſt, his Miniſter maketh it ſuch. And is this the Tradition?

2. Let *Hierome* ſpeak for himſelf, *Contr. Jovin. l.* 2. [*The Lord as a Type* (*or Figure*) *of his Blood, offered not Water, but Wine.*] Are not theſe words plain, till the Pope expound them?

IV. His next is *Cyprian, de Cœna Dom.* And, 1. Let the Reader note, that even *Bellarmine de ſcript. Eccl. in Cyprian* ſaith, that the Book which this Man citeth as St. *Cyprians*, [was neither *Cyprians, nor any Learned Mans*; and

and had neither Words nor Sentences worthy a Learned Man, but foolish and ridiculous Narations, and Fables.]

2. The words cited out of it are [*Panis iste quem Dominus discipulis porrigebat, non effigie sed natura mutatus, omnipotentia verbi factus est Caro*] But by [*Natura*] the Author plainly meaneth [*the Relative Nature*] and not the *Substance*. And it was not for nothing that *Bellarmine* contemneth him, who ever he was; for he is downright against Transubstantiation. *Cap* 2. He maketh the difference between this and common Meat to be, that, *Corporalis substantiæ retinens speciem, sed virtutis divinæ invisibili efficientia probans ad esse præsentiam:* It is but the presence of *Divine Virtue* that he affirms to be with the *Species of corporeal substance*. And plainer, *cap.* 3. [*when the Lord had said, Do this in my remembrance, This is my Body, and this my Blood*] *as oft as by these words and this faith it is done, that supersubstantial Bread and Cup, by solemn blessing hallowed, profiteth to the life and health of the whole Man; being both a Medicine and a Sacrifice, to heal our infirmities and purge our iniquities.* And shewing the difference between the Common part of Christ's last Supper, and this Spiritual Food, he addeth, that, [*when the perfideous mind of* Judas *touched this holy Meat, and the sanctified Bread entred his wicked Mouth, &c.*] So that he calleth it *sanctified Bread* after the Consecration.

And *Cap.*---- telling why Christ calleth the same both *Bread, Blood, Flesh, and his Body*, he saith, [*Panis est esca, &c. Bread is Meat, Blood is Life, Flesh is Substance, his Body the Church.* And *cap.* 4. *This Sacrament Christ calleth sometime his Body, sometime Flesh and Blood, sometime* Bread; *a Portion of Life eternally, which he Communicateth according to these visible things to corporal Nature.*

That

That common Bread *being turned into Flesh and* Blood, *procureth Life and increase to bodies* (that is, our common Concoction turneth common *Bread* into our *Flesh and* Blood;) *Therefore the Infirmity of our Faith being helped by the usual effect of things, by a sensible Argument is taught, that the effect of Life eternal is in Visible Sacraments; and that we are united to Christ, non tam Corporali quam spirituali transitione, not so much by a Corporal as by a Spiritual Transition.* And *cap. 6. His Conjunction and ours neither mingleth Person, nor uniteth Substances; but Consociateth Affections, and Confederateth Wills.*

And the same Author, or another, in *Cyprian's* Works, *de Unctione Chrysm. cap. 7.* Saith [*Our Lord at the Table where he last feasted with his Disciples, gave them with his own hands,* Bread *and Wine; but on the Cross he gave his* Body *to be wounded by the hands of Souldiers, that the sincere truth, and true sincerity, secretly imprinted in the Apostles, might expound to the Nations how the Wine and* Bread *was Flesh and* Blood; *and by what Reasons the Causes agreed to the Effects, and divers Names and Species were reduced to one Essence; and the Things signifying, and the things signified were called by the same Names,* (or known by the same Words) *By these Priviledges of supernatural Grace, by the eating of sanctified* Bread, *being refreshed, washed, and anointed, &c.*] Reader, here you see what Tradition saith.

Next out of *Cyprian de Lapsis*, he citeth words against them, that [*with defiled hands and mouths receive the* Body, *and drink the* Blood *of the Lord.*] Words which Protestants have more frequently than *Cyprian*; and are they on your side too?

But, shall *Cyprian* have leave to speak indeed? *Epist. ad Magn. cap. 4.* [*When our Lord calleth his* Body Bread, *con-*

congeſted by the adunation of many Grains, he ſheweth the Union of the People whom he bare: and when he called his blood wine, expreſſed out of many bunches of Grapes and Kernels, and made up into one, he ſignified one Flock united, &c.]

And *Epiſt. 63. Ad Cæcilium de Sacram.* Proving that the Sacrament ſhould not have *Water alone without Wine*, he ſaith *cap.* 2. [*That the Cup which is offered in commemoration of him be offered mixt with Wine. For when Chriſt ſaith, I am the true Vine, his blood is not water, but wine.* Nor *can his blood, by which we are redeemed and ſanctified, be ſeen to be in the cup, if wine be not in the cup, by which Chriſt's blood is ſhewed,* &c.

And *c.* 6. *We find the cup mixt which Chriſt offered, and that it was wine which he called his blood. Whence it is apparent that the blood of Chriſt is not offered, if wine be wanting to the cup; nor is the Lords Sacrifice celebrated by due ſanctification, unleſs our Oblation and Sacrifice anſwer his Paſſion.*

And *cap.* 9. *In the wine is ſhewed the blood of Chriſt, as in the water is underſtood the People.* (Is the water turned into the People?)

And *cap.* 10. *So the cup of the Lord is not water alone, nor wine alone, but muſt both be mixed; even as the body of the Lord cannot be meal (or flower) alone, or water alone, but both muſt be united, conjoined, and be bread by compoſition ſolidated.*

And *cap.* 12. [*As oft as we offer the cup in commemoration of the Lord and his Paſſion, let us do that which is manifeſt the Lord did.*] So much of *Cyprian.*

V. The next cited by him is *Tertullian*, ſaying; [*The fleſh is fed with the body and blood of Chriſt, that the Soul may be made fat with God.*]

Anſw. 1.

Answ. 1. The same we all say, even when we Administer the Sacrament: See the like in the *English* Liturgy, and the Directory: Are we therefore for Transubstantiation? 2. It is the *Representative body of Christ*, and not real flesh and blood: For he saith, that *he that eateth his flesh, and drinketh his blood, hath eternal life; and dwelleth in Christ, and Christ in him*, *John* 6. 54, 56. But the wicked, that eat the body of Christ Representative, have not eternal life, nor dwell in Christ.

Another citation from *Tertullian* is *lib. de Idololat.* [*To touch the body of our Lord with those hands which give bodies to Devils*, &c.]

Answ. Here is no more than we commonly say: This Man sure would prove that the Liturgy and Directory are both for his opinion. Is this the Proof of Universal Tradition?

Reader, *Tertullian* calls it *The body of Christ*, and so do we. Will you hear him speaking his own Sense, which this Man concealeth?

Cont. Marcion, l. 3. *c.* 19. [*Sic enim Deus in Evangelio quoq; vestro revelavit, panem corpus suum appellans, ut & hinc jam eum intelligas corporis sui figuram pani dedisse, cujus retro corpus in panem Prophetes figuravit, ipso Domino hic sacramentum postea interpretaturo.*] That is [*For so God even in your Gospel revealed, calling bread his body, that so hence you may understand, that he gave to bread the figure of his body; whose body the Prophet formerly figured into bread, the Lord himself being afterward to interpret this Sacrament.*] Here it is oft called *bread*, and this *bread* is called Christ's body, and the figure of the body given to *bread* it self, as was prefigured by the Prophets before Christ had a body.

And *Cont. Marc. l.* 1. 14. [*Nec panem* (*reprobavit*)

quo

quo ipſum corpus ſuum repreſentat,] [*He reprobated not bread, by which he repreſented his own very body.*] *Pamelius* hath no ſhift, but to ſay, that by *repreſenting* he meaneth *making preſent*, ſuch deceit will ſeem to prove to them *Univerſal Tradition:* And he citeth many other places, as for him, out of *Tertullian*, which have no more but his naming the Sacrament *Chriſt's body and blood*, as we all do.

Cont. Marc. l. 4. *c.* 40. He is yet plainer, ſaying [*The bread which he took and diſtributed to his Diſciples, that he made his body, ſaying, This is my body; that is, the* FIGURE *of my body: But it had not been the Figure of it, if he had not had a true Body. For an empty thing which is a phantaſm, can have no Figure; or if he therefore feigned* (or made) *bread to be his body, becauſe he wanted* (or had not) *a true body, then it was bread that he muſt deliver up for us: It made for* Marcion's *Vanity that bread ſhould be Crucified.* (All this is to prove againſt *Marcion* that Chriſt had a true body.) *But why doth he call bread his body, and not a Pumpion, which* Marcion *hath inſtead of a heart, not underſtanding that this was the old figure of Chriſt's body,* (*N. B.* had Chriſt fleſh then?) *who ſaid by* Jeremy [*They have deviſed a Device againſt me, ſaying, Come, let us caſt wood upon his bread; that is, the Croſs upon his body —— ſo alſo making his Teſtament in the mention of the Cup*, &c. *And that you may know the old figure of his blood in wine*, Eſaias ſaith, &c. *ſo now he conſecrated his blood in wine, who then figured wine in blood.*]

Let any thing but ignorance and impudence judge, whether here be not over and over, *bread and wine* after Conſecration, being the *repreſentative and figurative body and blood* of Chriſt, or *repreſenting and figuring* them fullier, as the Prophets had partly, or darkly done before.

But nothing will convince ſome that *rage, and are confident.*

I repeat *Tertullian*'s reproof of the denyers of the certainty of Senſe, *Lib de Annim. c.*17. [*Therefore if Cauſes are freed from the infamy* (of fallacy) *how much more Senſe, which Cauſes freely go before,* &c. *What doſt thou procacious Accademick? Thou overturneſt the whole State of Life; thou troubleſt the whole Order of Nature; thou blindeſt the Providence of God himſelf, as if he had made deceitful and lying Senſes the Lords of all his works, as they are to be known, inhabited, diſperſed, and enjoyed.--- It is not lawful for us to call thoſe ſenſes into doubt, leſt in Chriſt we deliberate of the belief of them; Leſt perhaps it be ſaid that he falſly ſaw Satan caſt down from Heaven, or falſly heard his Father's Voice teſtifying of him; or was deceived when he touched* Peter's *Mother-in-Law; or after felt ſome other Spirit of the Oyntment, which he received as to his Burial; and ſome other reliſh of the Wine which he* CONSECRATED *for the* MEMORIAL (or to be the Memorial) *of his blood.*] So much for *Tertullian.*

VI. He next citeth *Chryſoſtome*, ſaying that Chriſt [*makes us his Body, not only in belief, but in very deed*; and that *we eat and touch his Body.*] *Anſw.* And doth he not ſee how in citing theſe, he confuteth himſelf. 1. Chriſt doth really make *Us* his Body; that is, his Political and Miſtical Body: But *is it we* that this Man would prove Tranſubſtantiate into Chriſt's Body? I thought it had been the *Bread*, and not *Us.*

2. If we *touch Chriſt's Body* it muſt be his *Repreſentative Body*; for the Papiſts hold that we *touch* not the *real Fleſh and Blood of Chriſt*, but only certain *Accidents*, which now are not the Accidents of Chriſt's Body, nor of any other Subſtance.

It

It would be tedious to cite out of *Chryſoſtome* all that makes againſt them. Let theſe plain words ſerve to notifie his mind [*Epiſt. ad Ceſar. The Bread is made worthy to be honoured with the Name of the Fleſh of Chriſt, by the Prieſt's Conſecration; yet the Fleſh retains the properties of its incorruptible Nature, as the Bread doth its Natural Subſtance. Before the Bread is ſanctified we call it Bread; but when it is Conſecrated by the Divine Grace, it deſerveth to be called the Lords Body, though the Subſtance of the Bread ſtill remaineth.*]

Reader, This is the Tradition of the Church.

As to ſome Mens Cavil, that this Epiſtle is Spurious, it is fully confuted by Learned Men from ſufficient Teſtimony.

VII. The next cited is a word that ſeemeth, in ſound, to be for them, in *Cyril* (or ſome think *John*) of *Jeruſale'ms* Catechiſme. Read the words Tranſlated by himſelf; It is that Sentence which above all in the Ancients they moſt boaſt of, [*viz. Do not look on it as bare bread, and bare wine; for it is the body and blood of Chriſt: — For though thy Senſe ſuggeſt this to thee, yet let Faith confirm thee: Do not judge of the thing by the taſte, but rather from Faith hold for certain, ſo that thou haſt no doubt that the body and blood are given thee; knowing and accounting for certain, that this bread which is ſeen by us, is not bread, though our taſte judge it to be bread; but that it is the body of Chriſt: And the wine which is ſeen by us is not wine, but the blood of Chriſt.*]

Anſw. Here I deſire the Reader to note, 1. That this one Sentence is all that hath any *words that ſound like* his Sentence (that there is no true *bread and wine*) of all that he bringeth to prove Univerſal Tradition. 2. That this Book called *Cyril's Cat. Myſtagog.* is queſtioned. 3. That

the Auther plainly declareth himself against Transubstantiation.

Which I prove, 1. The Assertion which he stateth is, that the *bread and wine* (for so he calleth them) are not [*bare, or meer bread and wine*] but Christ's *body* and *blood*; which we all assert: As the King's Statue in Brass is not bare Brass. 2. He next bids us not *judge by our taste*, that it is *bare bread*. And after when he saith *it is not bread and wine*, and appealeth to Faith from Sense, it is but his repeating of what he before asserted; meaning that though Sense perceives nothing but *bare bread and wine*, yet Faith perceiveth Christ's *body and blood*; and so it is not to be called *bread and wine*, for all proper denomination is from the *Form*; and the Form of a Sacrament is *Relative*, (as of a *Statue*, *Image*, *Symbol*, *Sign*, *&c.*) and it is *Relatively* Christ's *body and blood*: So that it is but, that it's *bare bread*, that he denyeth; as we do.

3, Most fully, he tells us his mind, *Cat. 3. p. 235.* [*For as the bread of the Eucharist after the Invocation of the Holy Ghost, is no more* Common *bread, but is the body of Christ; so also this holy Oyntment is no more meer Oyntment, nor (if any one had rather so speak) Common, now it is Consecrated; but it is a Grace (or Gift) which causeth the presence of Christ, and the Holy Ghost; that is, of his Divinity:*] So that if you take him to assert the Transubstantiation of *bread*, you must say that he takes *Oyl* also to be *Transubstantiate* into *Grace*, or the Holy Ghost. For he saith, that *one is so* as the *other is changed*. That is, they are no more *meer or common bread, or Oyl*.

VIII. His last is out of *Justin Martyr*, who saith [*We do not take these things as Common and ordinary bread*, &c.

Answ.

Answ. 1. There is not one word in *Justin Martyr* here that we do not own, and say; (nor do we desire to worship God by any other Liturgy, or Order of Worship, than that which he describeth as then the Practice of the Christian Church. O that we might all unite in that described Order!

2. And if any may be yet unsatisfied what Tradition saith, hear *Justin* farther, *Apol.* 2. (Truly the first) [*when the President hath given thanks, and all the People acclaimed, those that with us are called Deacons, distribute to every one present* BREAD *and* WINE *and Water, and bring them to those that are absent.*] It is *bread and wine* when distributed.

And *Dial. Cum Tryph.* [*The Offering of Flower delivered to be offered for them that were cleansed of the Leprosie, was a Type of the* BREAD *of the Eucharist, which our Lord Jesus Christ commanded us to make in remembrance of his Passion.*]

Thus you see to what his boast of Universal Tradition is come.

Read but *Dallæus de Cultu Latinorum*, and you will see that there *Universal Tradition* was against them.

The foresaid Author of the Dialogue, called, [*Full and easie satisfaction which is the true Religion,*] to these forementioned addeth more, which you may read, *pag.* 140, *&c. viz. Irenæus* saying, [*For as the bread which is of the Earth, receiving the Divine Invocation, is not now common bread, but the Eucharist, consisting of two things, the Terrene and the Cœlestial, &c. Lib.* 4. *c.* 34.

Origen in *Mat.* 25. calling it [*Bread, and a typical and symbolical body, which profiteth none but the worthy Receivers, and that according to the proportion of their Faith; which no wicked man eateth, &c.*

Euseb.

Euseb. Cæsar. Demonstr. Evang. l. 1. c. 10. [*Celebrating duly the Memorial of the body and blood of Christ*—*Seeing we receive the Memorial of this Sacrifice, to be perfected on the Table, by the Symbols of his body and most pretious blood*—Lib. 8. *He delivered us to use bread as the Symbol of his own body.*

Ephr. (in Biblioth Photii, p. 415. Ed. Augustt.) *The body of Christ which Believers receive, loseth not his sensible substance, and is not separated from the intelligible grace.*

And *ad eos qui filii Dei, &c.* [*Take notice diligently, how taking bread in his hands he blessed it, and brake it, for a* FIGURE *of his immaculate Body; and he blessed the Cup, and gave it to his Disciples, as a* Figure *of his pretious blood.*

Theodoret in *Dialog. de Immutab.* against an *Eutychian*, who pleaded, that Bread in the Eucharist was turned into Christs Body, saith, [*The Lord who called that meat and bread, which naturally was his body, and who again called himself a Vine, did honour the Visible Signs with the Names of his Body and Blood; not having changed their Nature, but added Grace to Nature.*] Can any Protestant speak plainer than this?

And Dial. 2. [*The Divine Mysteries are Signs of the true Body.*

And further, answering the *Eutychian*, he saith, [*By the Net which thou hast made art thou taken: For even after the Consecration the mystical Signs change not their Nature, for they remain in all their first* SUBSTANCE, *Figure, and Form, and are visible, and to be handled as before.*] This is not plain enough for a Papist.

Nor *Gelasius cont. Nestor. & Eutych.* [*Verily the Sacrament of the body and blood of Christ which we take is a Divine*

Divine thing, for which and by which we are made partakers of the Divine Nature; and yet it ceaseth not to be the SUBSTANCE *and* NATURE *of bread and wine: And certainly the Image and similitude of the Body and Blood of Christ are celebrated in the action of the Mysteries.*] O dark sayings!

[*Cyril, Alex.* in *John* 4. *c.* 14. [*He gave to his believing Disciples fragments of bread, saying, Take, eat, this is my body.*]

Facundus is there cited as from *Molinæus* (*l.* 9. *c.* 5. *p.* 404. though I have not the Author) saying [*We call that the body and blood of Christ, which is the Sacrament of his body in the Consecrated bread and cup. Not that the bread is properly his body, and the cup his blood, but because they contain the Mystery of his body and blood.*]

To these I might add plain Testimonies out of most of the Ancients, who write on this subject: Such, *e.g.* as these words of *Gregor. Nyssen Orat. de Baptis.* ***As the Altar naturally is but common Stone, but being consecrated becometh a holy Table, an unspotted Altar; so the bread of the Eucharist is at first ordinary, but being mysteriously sacrificed, it is, and is called, The body of Christ, and is effectual to great things: And as the Priest who was yesterday a Lay-man, by the blessing of Ordination is made a Teacher of Godliness, and a Steward of the Mysteries, and though not changed in body or shape, yet is changed and made better as to his soul, by an invisible power and grace; so also by the same consequence Water, being nothing but Water of it self, yet blest by the heavenly grace, reneweth man by working in him the spiritual regeneration.***

Is *Stone* in the *Altar*, or the *Priest ordained*, or *Water in Baptism* transubstantiated?

If *Charles* the Great was a Heretick, the Pope is greatly

ly beholden to a Heretick. In his Epiſt. to *Alcunius* he ſaith, [*Chriſt at his Supper did break the Bread to his Diſciples, and likewiſe gave them the Cup, in Figure of his body and blood; and ſo left to us this great Sacrament for our benefit.*] This was his Tradition.

Amalarius Præf. de Offic. Eccleſ. [*I am ſwayed in all that I write by the judgment of holy men and godly Fathers; yet what I judge my ſelf I ſpeak: Thoſe things which are done in the celebration of Divine Service, are done in the Sacrament of the Paſſion of our Lord, as he himſelf commanded. Therefore the Prieſt offering the bread with the wine and water in the Sacrament, doth it in the ſtead of Chriſt; and the bread and wine and water in the Sacrament repreſent the fleſh and blood of Chriſt. For Sacraments are ſomewhat to reſemble thoſe things whereof they are Sacraments. Therefore let the Prieſt be like to Chriſt, as the bread and liquors are like the body and blood of Chriſt.*]

[*The Sacrament of the body of Chriſt is in ſome manner the body of Chriſt: For Sacraments ſhould not be Sacraments, if in ſome things they had not the likeneſs of that whereof they are* Sacraments. *Now by reaſon of this mutual likeneſs, they are often called by that which they repreſent, — Sacraments have the virtue to bring us to thoſe things, of which they are Sacraments.*]

Walafridus Strabo de reb. Eccl. cap. 16., ſaith, [*Chriſt gave to his Diſciples the Sacrament of his body and blood in the ſubſtance of bread and wine.*]

Bernard an. 1120. *Serm. de Purific. Mar.* ſaith, [*The Body of Chriſt in the Sacrament is the food of the Soul, not of the Belly; therefore we eat him not corporally, but in the manner that Chriſt is meat, in that ſame manner we underſtand that he is eaten.* And *Serm. de S. Martin.*

The

The ſame Fleſh is given us to this day, but Spiritually not Corporally.]

To conclude, If the words *This is my Body* are to be taken literally, then ſo are the reſt; [*This Cup is the New Teſtament in my Blood.*] And then the Cup is Tranſubſtantiated into the New Teſtament.

And he that at once doth believe that Chriſt hath a Glorified Spiritual Body, that Fleſh and Blood doth not enter into the Kingdom of Heaven, that the Bread and Wine ceaſe to be *Bread and Wine*, and are turned ſubſtantially into the very *Fleſh and Blood* of Chriſt, and yet that the Pope and his Clergy are not Enemies of Chriſt and Souls, who deny this *Blood* to the People, and give them but a half Chriſt and a half Sacrifice, when he is praiſed by all Saints for waſhing them from their ſins in his Blood; this Man and his Leaders ſeem to be Educated in ſuch an Academy, as *Feſtus* thought *Paul* had been, and to be made by Satan the Stumbling-block of the unbelieving World, to perſwade them to laugh at Chriſtianity as we do at the Fopperies of *Mahomet*'s Alcoran; and to make all the Nations of Heathens and Infidels believe that they cannot be Chriſtians, unleſs they will be mad and ſenſeleſs too: While Senſes, Reaſon, Scripture, the Hiſtory of the Church, and Writings of the Ancients, the Tradition and Judgement of the far greateſt part of the Church, together with Charity, Humanity, and Peace, are all denyed in obedience to *one Man*, that, becauſe one Prince and his Clergy made him the firſt Biſhop in his Empire and Councils, feigneth himſelf to be the Univerſal Monarch of the World; and undertaketh an Apoſtleſhip and Government at the Antipodes (when his zealouſeſt Biſhops formerly ſome of them thought there was no ſuch place;) and obligeth himſelf to the care of Souls farther than

Drake and *Candiſh* Sailed, even in abundance of unknown Lands; and (as his Agents confeſſed to the *Abaſſines*) where his Miſſioners have no acceſs.

The ſum of all the Hiſtory of this Matter is, The Fathers called it as we do, ſometime Chriſt's Body, and ſometime the *Figure*, or repreſentation of his Body, and often Bread: And from the *Name*, in the dark Age, the Thing grew controvated, and *France* was the chief Seat of the Contention: *Bellarmine* himſelf ſaith, that *an.* 820. [Paſchaſius Ratbertus, *an Abbot, was the firſt Man that ſeriouſly and copiouſly Wrote of the truth of the Body and Blood of the Lord in the Euchariſt againſt, Bertram,*] who he thinks was one of the firſt that Wrote againſt it. *Bell. de ſcript. Eccl. Johan. Pariſienſis* and the Sorboniſts concluded that neither Opinion was *de fide*: But the Pope chanced to be on the other, and the Council of *Trent* hath now made it *de fide*. *Qu.* Whether the Sorboniſts knew not that Tradition which Parents teach their Children? nor any of thoſe that were againſt *Ratbertus*?

But the Diſcourſer pretendeth in the end to Anſwer Objections: But he firſt made them himſelf ſo thin, that he might not deſpair of ſaying ſomething, which a Man deep in his Cups, or one that is little uſed to the Exerciſe of his Brain, might poſſibly take for a Rational Anſwer. But if the Reader be a Man that will be at ſo much pains to eſcape deluſion, as to Read over the Arguments againſt Tranſubſtantiation in the forementioned (little) Book of *R. B.* and then try whether he can here find them Anſwered; I may conjecture that he will not boaſt of the Diſcourſer's performances.

He begins the Objection with a [*why doth not this marvelous Change appear to our Senſes, as well as other marvelous works: as the Water turned into Wine,* &c.]

I con-

I confeſs it is ſtrange *Fleſh* and *Blood*, *that no ſenſe can perceive*: But a *ſpiritual Body* may be out of the perception of our Senſe. But did not the Diſcourſer know, that it is another kind of Objection that we make? Not [*why doth not God ſhew us the Miracle to our Senſe*?] but [*whether God deceive all our Senſes and Intellect, which there perceive Bread and Wine, when there is none*?] It is not, whether Senſe *perceive Chriſt*? but, [*whether Senſe perceive Bread and Wine*?] It is not, whether Senſe do *privatively not perceive*; but, whether it *here poſitively erre*, and the firſt *Intellective* perception of the ſenſate Object be an Errour?

But under the Coats of this firſt part, he brings in a little of the true Objection at laſt, [" *It would follow, that* " *we might call in queſtion the whole Myſtery of Chriſtia-* " *nity, &c.*]

His Anſwer to all is, *By a diſtinction of Miracles; ſome are to convince Unbelievers; ſome to ſanctifie and ſave Believers: And theſe are not to be the Object of our Senſes.* He inſtanceth in *Baptiſm, by which, as an outward and viſible Sign, is wrought an inviſible Grace in the Soul of the baptized; though view the Child as much as you will, you can by none of your Senſes perceive any mutation wrought.*

Anſw. As your *Tranſubſtantiation* ſeemeth deviſed to *make Infidels*, ſo doth your Doctrine of *Baptiſm* ſeem made to make *Anabaptiſts*. Is it by a *Miracle* that Baptiſm giveth Grace to the *Adult*, or not? If not, will not Men rather turn Anabaptiſts, than believe that Infants can have no Grace by Baptiſm, but by Miracle; when that Sacrament was inſtituted to give Grace to the Adult without a Miracle, and Scripture mentioneth no ſuch difference of the Effects? But if it be by Miracle to the

Adult, is it not alſo by Miracle, that Men receive Grace by Reading, Preaching, or other means? You'll never prove one a Miracle, and not the other. And before we come to the Diſpute between the Jeſuites and ſome Fryars, the *Arminians* againſt ſome *Calviniſts*, *Whether all Grace infuſed be a Miracle*, we muſt beſtow more time to agree of the *definition* of a *Miracle*, than is congruous to our preſent buſineſs. Overdoing is undoing: They that will make Men believe, that all Grace and Chriſtianity is a Miracle, I doubt, do but drive men from the belief of all.

But this Diſcourſer tells us, that *you ſee no change on a Child. Anſw.* And is all a Miracle that is unſeen? Is *God* a Miracle? Are Angels and all Spirits Miracles? Is the Soul of a Man, or of a Beaſt, or the Life of a Plant a Miracle, becauſe unſeen? Then all Grace however wrought is a Miracle; yea, and every thought of a mans heart both good and evil.

Is all a Miracle that is done by God alone, without ſecond Cauſes? Then his moving the firſt created Motor were a Miracle. And yet who can ſay, that no ſecond Cauſe is uſed in the conveyance of Grace?

But if you could prove that Word and Sacraments work Grace by miracle, you would make us leſs wonder that it is no more common: And here the Prieſt cannot do this Miracle when he will, for it muſt be on a diſpoſed Subject: But your Prieſts can make *Bread* to be no *Bread*, by miracle, when they will. But S. *Paul* ſaith, *Are all works of miracles?* But how much greater Miracles your Prieſts are feigned to work, than the raiſing of *Lazarus*, or any ſuch like; and how your feigned Miracles are confuſed, is ſhewed fully by the foreſaid Author.

But the Queſtion, whether the Sacrament work by miracle,

miracle, is one; and that, whether it be *it self a miracle*, is another. Gods *workings* are secret to us, as the wind whose course we cannot describe, *Joh.* 3. But is the Sacrament it self a Miracle? The Word is not so: Baptism is not so: You feign not your Confirmation to be so: (though *Cyril* aforesaid make the change of the *Bread* and of the *Oyl* to be alike.) And is only this one Ordinance a Miracle?

But if it were, what's that to the positive deception of all our Senses?

He tells us of the Hypostatical Union, answered before: What Senses are deceived by that? Doth Sense judge that Christ was not God? Or that there is no Trinity? Or that a Virgin may not conceive? Not at all: Sense neither tells us that it is so, or that it is not. Therefore to tell us of things *hidden from Sense*, is impertinent. All the spiritual and noblest parts of Nature are out of the reach of our bodily Senses: But Sense is our only first perceiver of all its own proper Objects, and the Intellects first perception of them, is only as they are sensate.

But the only pertinent Answer given, is, [*we may alway trust our Senses about their own Objects, and in due circumstances; and when we have not positive grounds to think, either God Almighty by himself, or by an Angel, or permissively by a Devil, represents things otherwise than they are.*]

Answ. When things are *represented otherwise than they are*, it is either in *other sensible qualities than they have*, or else something else is under those qualities, than what they naturally signifie; or else it is by altering the Sense, Organ, or Medium. The first is a meer contradiction: To *make* an Object to be what it *was not*, is usual; but to make it at the same instant to *be what it is not*, is a contradiction. Therefore by *representing* you cannot rationally

nally mean this; *e. g.* To repreſent a rough thing as ſmooth, a *little* thing as *great*, a white thing as black, by real alterations of thoſe qualities making them to be ſo.

But to make them *ſeem* ſo, when really they are not ſo, muſt be by the failing of the *Medium*, *Organ*, *Senſe*, *Phantaſie*, or *Intellect*.

1. And for the *Medium*, no doubt but God can ſo alter it eaſily, as to deceive all mens Senſes: And in our preſent caſe, where all the five Senſes of all the ſound men in the World, that try, are pretended to be deceived, God is *able* to do it, by altering the *Medium* of *every Senſe* that hath a *Medium*: (For whether *tactus* have *any* diſtinct from the Organ is undetermined.)

2. And the ſame is to be ſaid of the *Organ*, *Senſe*, *Phantaſie*, and *Intellect*: *Quoad potentiam*, no doubt but that God that can annihilate them can *deprave* them when he pleaſe, and make a man ſenſeleſs, deceived, doting, melancholy, or mad; either *privatively*, by withholding his neceſſary natural aids; or *poſitively*, by overcoming contraries.

But the Queſtion is not, Whether God *can* do this *per potentiam*; but, Whether he *will* do it, or *can will to do it* in ſuch caſe as ours, in conſiſtence with his *Governing Wiſdom* and *Goodneſs*, and that *Truth* and *Conſtancy* which he manifeſteth in the Government of the World. That he may and doth penally make men ſenſeleſs, mad, and dead, we doubt not; and that thoſe that would not receive the love of the Truth, that they might be ſaved, may permiſſively be given up to ſtrong deluſions to believe a Lye: *That all they might be damned that believed not the truth, but had pleaſure in unrighteouſneſs*, 2 *Theſſ.* 2. 11, 12.

But

But that God doth thus (not penally, but) as a *blessing*, and not upon mens forsaking him and his Truth, but while he is communicating *Himself* and *his Truth* to them, and to make a *Deceit* or *Lye* the *ordinary Means* of *Truth* and *Holiness*, and that he should do this ordinarily as the *Governour*, *Benefactor*, and *Saviour* of Mankind, and so make Falshood (not of his *permitting*, but of his own *effecting*) to be the ordinary way of *saving men*; all this is contradiction; contrary to his Will revealed in *Nature* and *Scripture*, and contrary to his Perfection, who needed not to Govern the World by Deceit or Lyes, as wanting neither *Power*, *Wisdom*, or *Goodness* to do otherwise. Grace consisteth in the *illumination* of the *Mind*, which revealeth Truth, and not in the Errour or Deception of the Mind, by deceiving the Senses. Gods Works of Nature discerned or perceived by our Natural Sense and Phantasie, and so by Natural Apprehension of the Intellect, are his *first way* of Revelation, in which he is most *clear* and *constant*. And we are *Men* and *Animals* before we are *Believers*, and *Faith* is grafted into the Stock of *Nature*, and *rectifieth*, *illuminateth*, *elevateth*, *perfecteth it*, but doth not destroy it, deprave it, deceive men, and make them mad or senseless.

But you tell us of many excepted Cases, in which God may deceive our Senses, or we may not trust them: No doubt; we may never trust them for that which belongs not to them, but is beyond them, (as to know whether God can assume Flesh, whether he can impregnate a Virgin; whether there be *Trinity* in *Unity*: There be many things that Sense is no Judge of, one way or other. But when there is an *Object near us*, *duly scituate*, which *Sense* was made to perceive, (as a *quantitative*, *sapid*, *odoriferous*, *&c. substante*) and there is no natural defect

in

in Medium, Organ, Senſe, Phantaſie, or Natural Intellect, to tell us of ſuch excepted Caſes, is, 1. To deface or ſlander the Providence of God, who Governeth by truth and order: 2. To make *Mercy* to conſiſt in the ſubverſion of Nature, and *Penal Acts* to be *gracious*. 3. To leave man utterly uncertain of every Article of Faith, yea, to bring in Scepticiſm, and leave us no certainty in the world. For if God may and do, in ſo many Caſes as you name, deceive all the Senſes and Perceptions of all men, even his faithfulleſt Servants in the World, by *Himſelf*, by *Angels*, by *Devils permitted*, how ſhall any man know when he doth otherwiſe? You ſay, [*'till we have poſitive grounds to think theſe.*] But, if God *can do thus*, how can you tell that he doth it not without *telling us*, or giving us *poſitive grounds*? And who knoweth what thoſe poſitive grounds are? Or that ever he read or heard a word, or ſaw a thing which you may call a *ground*? For if you know not *firſt* that the perception of Senſe, and things ſenſate is true, you know not that ever you *heard any* thing to ſuſpend your belief of them: Or that what you hear is true. And how will you prove againſt the Infidels, that God cannot Lye, or deceive us by a Prophet, an Angel, or a Voice from Heaven, or a Writing, if he can and do daily deceive all our Senſes, about ſuch Objects as they are made to perceive?

And what a War do you raiſe againſt the life of Faith, as if it had not difficulties enough without ſuch? If you ſhould ſet a Candle before Infidels or doubting perſons, and ſay, [*If this be Light, the Goſpel is falſe,*] would you be a Preacher of Chriſt or Satan? And if you ſet the Conſecrated *Bread and Wine* before them, and ſay, [*See them, ſmell, taſte, feel them; if this be Bread and Wine the Goſpel is falſe;*] would you not be the Preachers of Infidelity?

But

But I must consider, that so much being said already in the foresaid *Dialogue*, which you give no Answer to, I must rather stay till that be answered, than repeat it here.

But, at the least, you satisfie us, when you grant, that *we must trust our Senses 'till we have positive grounds for the contrary*; and so the Case before us is this: You say, [*They that will be saved, must believe that God in mercy to illuminate mens minds, deceiveth all the sound mens Senses in the world* (that try) *about those things which naturally are the proper Objects of Sense, and duly qualified; and they must believe that there is no Bread or Wine, when all their Senses present them as such to the Intellect, which necessarily perceiveth them as such as sensate; and they must believe, that to govern, illuminate, and sanctifie us by such deceit, God enableth every Priest, how ignorant and wicked soever, to verefie all the Contradictions before opened, and to work*, as oft as he pleaseth, in every Mass above thirty Miracles, with many miraculous aggravations.] And the proof of all this is, 1. That the same Christ that said [*I am the Door, the true Vine, the Shepherd, a Sower, a Husbandman, the Bridegroom, and spake ordinarily by Parables, and said in this same Sacrifice or Sacrament* [*This Cup is the New Testament in my Blood*;] *and in all these is to be understood parabolically; yet saying at the same time* [*This is my Body*] *is to be understood literally, though S.* Paul *over and over call it Bread.*] 2. *And this Exposition is delivered to us by the Roman Pope and his Clergie, and by some Priests in the Ninth and Tenth Ages, when their own Writers say, that their Popes were Monsters not to be named, and the Ages were for horrid Ignorance the shame of the Church. And after that,* 1215. *a General Council Decreed it first, which also Decreed the extermina-*

tion of all Christians as Heretícks, that will believe man's Senses herein, and the Excommunication and Deposition of all Temporal Lords, that will not exterminate all such Subjects, and the disobliging their Vassals from their Allegiance, and giving their Dominions to others: while yet the Judgment and Tradition of the far greatest part of the Christian World is against them, and the Writings of the ancient Doctors of the Church; and the Pope and his Clergie dare not pretend to have received by Memory and Tradition an Exposition of the Bible, nor do give us any proof of their pretended Tradition of this one Text, that is considerable, besides their own bare word. This is the true Case.

POSTSCRIPT.

SInce the Writing of this, I first saw *Larrogues* French Discourse, and therein the Citation of *Joh. Parisiensis* Opinion about Transubstantiation, and the *Sorbonists* determination, that neither Opinion was *de fide*, and determined: And did they not then know Tradition?

Since that I have seen Bishop *Cousin's* History of Transubstantiation, which so fully proveth the Novelty of it, as against the Tradition and Judgment of the Church, and that by Fathers and many Councils, in all Ages till *Innoc.* 3. and even after *Petrus Blesensis*, and *Steph. Ædunensis* (who first name it) and *Innoc.* 3. who first established it, few believed it in most Countries, as their own Authors confess; that I repented that I had needlesly

medled

medled with the Citation of Authors, which is done by him ſo much better: And indeed ſuch unanſwerable Teſtimony is produced by him, (and that briefly in a ſmall Volumn) to prove that the conſtant Judgment of the Church hath been againſt Tranſubſtantiation, that I need not refer the doubting Reader to any other Book, nor provoke the Papiſts to try their ſtrength upon any other: (Though *Hoſpinian*, *Uſher*, *Chamier*, *Spalatenſis*, *Albertinus*, and abundance more, have done it beyond all reaſonable contradiction.)

FINIS.